

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 27th July 1953.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, at half-past eight of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Flood relief in Kollegal taluk.

* 1082-A Q.—SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD (on behalf of Sri S. C. Virupakshiah): Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether in respect of the floods in the Cauvery in July 1953 in Kollegal taluk in Coimbatore district, he has received a report from the Collector about—

(a) the number of houses either damaged or collapsed;

(b) the number of persons rendered homeless; and

(c) the relief measures extended to flood victims?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“(a) to (c) The Government have no information but have called for a report from the Collector of Coimbatore in the matter.”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD:—“May I know why no report was called for from the Collector immediately?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“This is a short notice question. I think the hon. Member is blaming me for waiving notice. Notice was given on the 23rd. We have not yet got information.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“May I know why the Government did not call for a report previously, that is, before the short notice question was given?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“We must get details and not simply get reports saying there were floods. We know there were floods in Kollegal. We must get detailed information and for this we want some time to elapse.”

Admission into the Medical Colleges.

* 1082-B Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Scheduled Caste students who have been given admission into the Medical Colleges this year categorically; and

(b) the total number of candidates admitted into the colleges this year?

[27th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) & (b) Out of 355 admissions in all, Scheduled Caste admissions number 21.”

SRI S. VEMIAH :—“May I know the number of backward community candidates and women candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“The main question relates to Scheduled Castes, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member may put a separate question.”

SRI A. RATHINAM :—“May I know what amount is levied by the authorities of medical institutions as caution deposit from the Harijan students this year?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member may put a separate question.”

Promulgation of orders under section 41 of the City Police Act near Assembly buildings.

* 1082-C Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state whether it is a fact that orders under section 41 of the City Police Act, Madras, have recently been promulgated by the Commissioner of Police in the area surrounding the Assembly buildings in Madras City; and if so, the reasons for the same?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“An order under section 41 of the Madras City Police Act prohibiting processions, etc., passed by the Commissioner of Police and applicable to the whole of the City is already in force. The Commissioner of Police had good reasons to believe that attempts might be made by certain individuals and organizations to stage demonstrations in thoroughfares and areas that adjoin the Assembly buildings while the Legislature is in session. With a view to maintain public peace which would be endangered by demonstrations and counter-demonstrations of rival sections, the Commissioner made the order under section 41 referred to in the question. The decorum and the orderly proceedings of the House must be protected from disturbance. No new restrictions were placed on the public; the object of passing a separate order was specially to invite the attention of the public to the necessity for a strict compliance with the order in the areas specified during the session of the Legislative Assembly.”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“May I know whether the Police Commissioner obtained the previous order of the Government to promulgate this order?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Yes, Sir.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“May I know whether the Government are against peaceful demonstrations as well?”

[27th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Round about the Assembly, Sir."

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—" May I know whether the Government have given instructions to the Police officers to use tear gas and lathis freely? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" No tear gas was used and no lathi charge was made round about the Assembly."

SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" May I know whether the order was issued under the orders of the Government or whether the police took the initiative in the matter? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. Chief Minister has already answered the question."

SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" May I know whether the Police Commissioner asked for instructions or whether the Government took the initiative to give instructions to the Police Commissioner in this respect? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Further enquiry into the matter is not desirable. I have already stated that the Government issued previous instructions."

SRI C. PULLA REDDI :—" May I know how many times this section has been applied to the approaches of the Assembly buildings, Sir? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I am afraid, as long as there is no permanent law to maintain peace round about the Assembly, we will have to use it many, many times."

*Supply of periodicals and journals to libraries.**

* 1006 Q.—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether any Government orders are in vogue regulating the supply of periodicals and journals to Government libraries and free reading rooms run by local boards and municipalities;

(b) whether any periodicals or journals are prohibited from such libraries and free reading rooms; and

(c) if so, what are their names and the reasons for their prohibition?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" (a) No.

" (b) & (c) Do not arise."

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" Is it a fact that even when representations were made for the supply of periodicals to certain reading rooms and libraries under Government and municipalities, certain periodicals belonging to the Opposition parties were rejected by the Government? "

[27th July 1953]

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The Government in January 1952 ordered that it was not necessary to maintain a list of periodicals and journals for use in public libraries and reading rooms and that the managements of these institutions should, in future, be permitted to arrange for the purchase of books and periodicals for their libraries in conformity with the provisions in the rules framed under the Madras Public Libraries Act, 1948. The following are the conditions prescribed in the Madras Public Libraries Rules, 1950, in regard to the purchase of books and periodicals for use in aided libraries :—

(i) The library shall have books and not merely newspapers and current periodicals.

(ii) The indents for books to be purchased for libraries shall receive the prior approval of the local library authority. The books to be purchased shall conform to the requirements mentioned below :—

(a) They shall be of general interest and of cultural value.

(b) The books, if they are stories or novels, shall be by standard authors and shall not be in doubtful taste.

(c) Books abusing communities or religions shall not be purchased.

(d) Books or magazines which are in doubtful taste or which contain undesirable pictures shall not be purchased.

There are no further instructions over and above these ones, Sir.”

8-40
a.m.

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN :—“ Are the Government aware of the fact that a publication of ‘ Bhagavat Gita ’ by one Anna of the Ramakrishna Mutt was banned from public libraries mistaking the author for Annadurai? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I am not aware of it, Sir.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ If any more information is wanted, I may be able to give, Sir.”

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Is it a fact that the Director of Public Instruction has instructed all library authorities not to allow journals like ‘ Visalandhra ’ and Soviet journals? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ No such instructions have been issued.”

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—“ My question was not only relating to supply of books. I put a specific question with regard to periodicals belonging to the Opposition parties, particularly the Communist Party and the Dravida Kazhagam. There were representations made by Municipal Councillors for the supply of ‘ Viduthalai ’ and ‘ Janasakthi ’ to the reading rooms under the municipalities. They were first rejected by the Municipal Commissioners. Then the matter was referred to the Inspector of Municipal

27th July 1953]

Councils and Local Boards and later it went before the Director of Public Instruction. So, these journals are specifically prohibited. May I know the reasons for this? "

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" The hon. Member is presumably referring to the state of affairs some time earlier. There was some conflict of views between the municipalities and the Government earlier. But the Government Order of 1952 stated that it was unnecessary to maintain a list of periodicals and journals. The whole question is governed by the instructions that have been read out already by me."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" May I know whether the Government are prepared to pass general orders providing that all journals of public interest be supplied to municipal and Government libraries? "

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" There is a Public Libraries Act and the rules under it are in force in the State. The supply or purchase of these books and periodicals is governed by the provisions of the Act and the rules made thereunder."

SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAICKER :—" May I know whether the Government have issued any orders that ' Viduthalai ', ' Dina Thanthi ', ' Nam Nadu ' and ' Janasakthi ' should not be purchased by the Cuddalore Municipality? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The answer was given in reply to Mr. Kalyanasundaram's question."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" My question was whether the Government are prepared to issue orders both to the municipal and Government libraries to see that all journals of public interest are purchased by the authorities concerned? "

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" Discretion is given to the libraries concerned to be exercised in conformity with the Act and rules made thereunder."

Planning Adviser to report on famine conditions in the State.

* 1083 Q.—SRI K. T. KOSALRAM (on behalf of Sri R. V. Swaminathan) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government of India proposed to send a Planning Adviser to the Government of Madras to report about the famine conditions in this State;

(b) whether the Government of Madras refused such advice; and

(c) if so, why?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" (a) No such proposal has been received by the State Government.

" (b) & (c) Do not arise."

[27th July 1953]

Tribunals constituted under the Madras Estates Abolition Act.

* 1084 Q.—

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member Sri M. Rajeswara Rao is not in his place. The question and answer will be printed in the Proceedings.”

SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether representations from the Bar and the General Public have been received by the Government regarding the difficulties felt by them as a result of the cumbersome procedure followed and the long delay in disposing of the cases by the Tribunals constituted under the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Land Act, 1948; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ (a) & (b) The answer ^a is placed on the table of the House.”

*Legal assistance to Harijans of Tamirga village,
Gudivada taluk.*

* 1085 Q.—SRI G. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state whether it was a fact that the Harijans of Tamirga village of Gudivada taluk requested the Government for legal assistance some four months back in respect of a civil suit instituted by Government against the Harijans of the whole village, regarding the dispute of the ownership of land in R.S. Nos. 510 and 495 (a village site poramboke of the Harijans of Mesakamalapalli)?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ No. They requested the write off of Rs. 429-0-6 which was awarded by High Court as costs to Government in an appeal preferred by the Harijans to establish their title to the fields in question. The matter is under consideration.”

SRI G. RAMA RAO :—“ There has been no instance where legal assistance has been given in the State to Harijans even though our Constitution provides for the same and also the State declares it to be its policy. So, will the Government at least consider the waiving of the collection of dues in this case? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The hon. Member's statement is not correct. There are instances where legal assistance has been rendered. If a separate question is put I shall be able to give the answer.”

SRI M. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—“ In view of the fact that Harijan Sivoijamadars who have been in possession of land for the last twenty or thirty years have been evicted by the neighbouring rich landholders and in view of the fact that the matter has been referred to the revenue authorities who in turn referred the

27th July 1953]

matter to courts, will the Government dispose of the matter speedily? And will they also issue orders conferring upon the ryots the right to the land under the Land Assignment Rules?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The cases are already before the courts. We must await the decisions of the courts."

Harijan Welfare Officers.

* 1086 Q.—SRI A. RATHINAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state whether the Harijan Welfare Officers in the State are all under the direct supervision of the Director of Harijan Welfare?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" The District Welfare Officers are all under the immediate control of the Collectors concerned."

SRI A. RATHINAM :—" May I know what are the functions of the Harijan Welfare Officers, how many such officers are there in the State and how many of them are Harijans?"

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" The District Welfare Officers attend to amelioration work relating to the 'eligible communities' and the number of officers is 23. To say how many of them are Harijans, I require notice."

Repairs to tanks in shrotriyam villages of Bhogole firka, Kavali taluk.

* 1087 Q.—SRI B. RAMAKRISHNA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representation was received from the ryots of Adireddipalem, Guravareddipalem, Chintalagirivari Kandri, etc., of Bhogole firka, Kavali taluk, Nellore district, that all shrotriyam villages were not taken by the Government and that their tanks were not repaired for the last twenty years although they repeatedly requested the proprietors to do so; and

(b) if so, what action the Government have taken on these representations?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" (a) & (b) The Government have not received any representation. The Collector received representations in June 1952 from the ryots of Chintalagirivari Khandriga, Bhaskaravari Khandriga and Harellapad shrotriems. He is taking steps to repair the tanks which are in need of repairs. Notices have been issued to the proprietors to undertake and execute repairs to the tanks failing which the repairs will be done by the Government and the cost recovered from the proprietors."

[27th July 1953]

Pumpsets operating in Kalingarayan channel.

* 1088 Q.—SRI K. R. NALLASIVAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state what action has been taken by the Government to remove the unauthorized pumpsets operating in the Kalingarayan channel?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“The Government are awaiting a report from the Chief Engineer.”

SRI K. R. NALLASIVAM:—“சட்டத்திற்கு விரோதமாக அமைக்கப் பட்டிருக்கும் இஞ்சின்களை எடுத்து வாடவேண்டுமென்ற சர்க்கார் உத்தரவுக்குப் பிறகும் சட்ட விரோதமாக பம்ப் செடடுகள் ஓடிக்கொண்டிருக்கின்றனவா?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“We are awaiting the report of the Chief Engineer.”

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM:—“Representations were made to the Government both on behalf of the ryots of Kalingarayan and Pugalur channels for removing these pumpsets which have been fixed by rich landlords belonging to the Congress party. Then, the Government issued orders, which were published in the Gazette, prohibiting these pumpsets. In spite of the Government Order remaining in force, the pumpsets are still being continued. May I know the reasons for the same?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“I do not know whether the hon. Member is referring to the Pugalur channel. So far as the Kalingarayan channel is concerned, we are awaiting the report.”

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN:—“Are the Government aware that even in this Kalingarayan channel, there is wholesale unauthorized operation of pumpsets by the wealthy landowners?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“The hon. Member may put a separate question.”

Eviction suits under the Malabar Tenancy Act.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“Sir, questions 1089, 1090 and 1095 relate to the same subject. I shall answer all the three questions together.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Yes.”

1089 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state how many eviction suits were filed in the Courts of Malabar under the Malabar Tenancy Act within the six months and before 15th March 1953?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“4,417.”

* 1090 Q.—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state what is the total number of suits for eviction filed under the Malabar Tenancy Act between 15th February and 15th March 1953?

27th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
“ 3,078.”

* 1095 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state the number of eviction suits filed in Malabar between 1st January and 28th February 1953 and between 1st March and 16th March 1953?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—

“ Between 1st January and 28th February 1953—632.

“ Between 1st March and 16th March 1953—2,597.”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ Are the Government aware that several courts have not stayed such suits and are proceeding with the trial and in view of this, will Government issue an Ordinance staying all eviction suits and eviction proceedings pending disposal of the Malabar Tenancy Bill now before the Assembly? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Sir, I think the courts act under the law prevailing now. The comprehensive Bill on the subject is before the Joint Select Committee which will be meeting shortly.”

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—“ Sir, in view of the fact that the comprehensive Bill does not contain any provisions to tighten up eviction proceedings, would the Hon. Minister in charge agree to be influenced by the large number of eviction suits? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Yes, Sir. I will consider.”

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—“ Sir, inasmuch as 2,000 suits have been filed in the course of 15 days and many of them are intended to circumvent the possible change under the Tenancy Legislation, will the Government be pleased to stop all evictions by means of an Ordinance? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Sir, the issue of an Ordinance is an extraordinary thing which requires to be looked into carefully.”

SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ Sir, do the numbers given include the number of suits in the Hosdrug District Munsif's Court in South Kanara and what was the number of cases there? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ I want notice, Sir.”

SRI R. KRISHNAN :—“ Sir, have the Government got any programme to stop the Jenmis from evicting the peasants, who have not been able to pay arrears of rent due to drought? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ All that will be gone into when we consider the Bill.”

SRI C. H. KANARAN :—“ Sir, the Hon. Minister said that the issue of an Ordinance is an extraordinary thing. In Malabar,

[27th July 1953]

eviction itself is an extraordinary thing, because there are a large number of eviction suits. Will Government find a way immediately to stop the eviction suits proceeding further? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, if it is so extraordinary as to warrant exceptional action to be taken, it will be taken."

SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR :—" For how long will the stay order remain, Sir? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Until the new legislation is put on the Statute Book, Sir."

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—" Sir, can we know whether there is a specific provision in the existing Malabar Act enabling ryots to pray for a stay order? If there is no such provision, would the Government consider passing an immediate law to prevent such eviction suits being filed? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Under the existing law, all eviction suits stand stayed."

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—" Both because three to four thousand suits have been filed in a month and also because of a recent decision of the Madras High Court, which has stripped the tenants because they had been under the impression prevailing in the mufassal courts that they should deposit rents in advance, there has arisen an extraordinary situation now. Would the Hon. Minister consider the question of meeting the extraordinary situation by an extraordinary remedy, viz., an Ordinance? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Yes, Sir. For that I may probably be given some time to examine the matter carefully."

Trichembaram Higher Elementary School, Taliparamba.

* 1091 Q.—**SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state the reasons why the Government withdrew the recognition of the Trichembaram Higher Elementary School in Taliparamba, North Malabar, in the middle of the school-year 1952-53, and gave permission to the newly recognized elementary school without permission to open lower standards also?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" The recognition of the Trichembaram Higher Elementary School was withdrawn for the reason that the management of the School violated the provision in the rules relating to the grant of recognition and aid to elementary schools and failed to carry out the orders of the Departmental Officers.

" Permission was given to the newly recognized Elementary School for the opening of standards VI to VIII only, as the Local School Committee had applied for permission to open Higher Elementary School alone in the village, there being no Higher Elementary Schools within a radius of four miles

27th July 1953]

of the village. The School Committee and a private party have subsequently applied for permission for the opening of Lower Elementary School also and the question of granting them permission is under the consideration of the authorities."

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—" I am glad that the lower standards are also recognized. But is it not a fact that the order given first to the department was that permission was accorded to start the higher elementary school in the place of the de-recognized one and is it not a fact that in the spirit of the order given to the department all the eight standards can be started? If so, why was it that the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Coimbatore, gave an order that only three classes can be started? "

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" The Divisional Inspector of Schools reports that in view of that, permission to open a Higher Elementary School in the locality with standards six to eight was granted by him, as there was no Higher Elementary School within a radius of four miles and children of lower classes were admitted in schools near by. This matter was reconsidered on application made and permission has been given."

Dam across Mampuzha in Kozhikode taluk.

* 1092 Q.—SRI A. APPU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal to put up a dam across the Mampuzha river in Kozhikode taluk to prevent the influx of salt water into the paddy fields;

(b) whether it is a fact that paddy crops on about 500 acres of wet lands were destroyed as the temporary mud dam was not put up by the Public Works Department this year;

(c) what amount is spent annually to put up this temporary dam here; and

(d) whether there is any proposal with the Government to put up a permanent dam here as early as possible?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" (a) Yes.

" (b) A temporary dam was put up this year also and maintained. But as the north-east monsoon was extremely poor this year, the level of fresh water in front of the dam was low, and that of the salt water in the rear of the dam was high. There was, therefore, leakage of salt water through the planks of the locks and whenever the lock was opened for boat traffic, some salt water entered and got mixed up with the fresh water above the dam. As the level of the water was so low, only some low-lying lands on the river margin were affected but not the large extent of high-level

[27th July 1953]

lands. The extent so affected was not so large as 500 acres. The failure of monsoon this year had also its share in the destruction of the crops that occurred.

“(c) The amounts annually spent are—

	RS.
1947-48	4,594
1948-49	8,533
1949-50	3,053
1950-51	1,962
1951-52	1,583
1952-53	1,148

“(d) Yes. The proposal is under consideration.”

SRI A. APPU :—“ May I know, Sir, in what stage the proposal now is and has an estimate been prepared? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ There was a proposal for an estimated cost of Rs. 3 lakhs; but as it was expected that it would benefit only an extent of 170 acres, that proposal was dropped. The Chief Engineer has, however, reported that the possibilities of opening a regulator bridge proposed to be constructed by the Highways department across the river will be examined when the proposals of the bridge take a definite shape.”

Water-supply for Parchur firka in Bapatla taluk.

* 1093 Q.—SRI K. VENKAIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether steps are being taken to arrange water-supply for the Parchur firka in Bapatla taluk and relieve the scarcity of water in that firka; and

(b) the time that will be taken for the arrangement?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ (a) During the year 1952-53, 4 works at Cherukur village, 2 works at Upputur village and 5 works, i.e., at (i) Gollapudi, (ii) Bhurayapalem, (iii) Parchur, (iv) Uppalapadu and (v) Annavaram villages in Parchur firka, were programmed for execution and out of these, two works at Cherukur were completed.

“(b) The remaining nine works will be completed during 1953-54.”

SRI K. VENKAIAH :—“ Sir, in view of the fact that representations have been made to the Government that improvements to Parchur vagu may be made so that the water may be preserved, will the Government consider the proposal? ”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ Yes, Sir.”

27th July 1953]

Subsidy to Tanjore District Board for maintenance of elementary schools.

* 1094 Q.—SRI S. VENKATRAMA AYYAR: Will the Hon. 9 a.m. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) why grant of subsidy towards the maintenance of elementary schools under the compulsory scheme was denied to the Tanjore District Board; and

(b) whether a representation has been made to the Government by the Tanjore District Board in the matter?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) The policy of the Government is to give subsidies to local bodies towards the cost of the Scheme of Compulsory Elementary Education, only in cases where there is need for aid from the Government judged from the financial position of the district board concerned. The Tanjore District Board has been having a surplus both in its Elementary Education Fund and its General Fund, and has all along been in a position to meet the cost of the scheme of compulsory education from its funds. The Government did not therefore give any subsidy to the district board towards the maintenance of elementary schools under the compulsion scheme.

“(b) Yes.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“Is the system of extending elementary education in this State through the compulsory education scheme still in force, and if so, in how many districts is it in force?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“To the extent to which it was introduced, it is in force. But, further extension was kept in abeyance from 1949.”

SRI S. VENKATRAMA AYYAR :—“Are the Government aware that the Tanjore District Board is deficit in the elementary education budget consecutively for the last three years?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“The revised estimate for 1952-53 and the budget estimate for 1953-54 of the elementary education fund of the Tanjore District Board are expected to close with a surplus of Rs. 1,390 and with a deficit of Rs. 9,000 respectively.”

SRI V. CHIDANANDAM :—“Has compulsory elementary education been introduced throughout any one of the districts in this State?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“No, Sir.”

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—“What are the districts in which it is in force and why has it been kept in cold storage since 1949?”

[27th July 1953]

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ In view of the decision to introduce basic education and with a view to review the whole position, it was suspended. Now, the scheme of extending elementary education, with a view to bringing in more children and to serve the purpose of compulsion ultimately, is being implemented.”

[Question 1095 answered—vide page 1423 ante.]

Madanapalle Thermal Station.

* 1096 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) when electricity will be supplied from the Madanapalle Thermal Station; and

(b) whether the Government propose to extend the supply of electricity for agricultural purposes to the whole of Madanapalle and Vayalpad taluks?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ (a) Supply of electricity to Madanapalle Town has been given from 15th May 1953.

“ (b) A scheme for supply of power to 24 villages in Vayalpad, Madanapalle and Chandragiri taluks is under the consideration of the Electricity department.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ Will the Government increase the number of villages from 24, as lift irrigation is the only irrigation in Madanapalle and Vayalpad taluks? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ Sir, supply of power is given on a commercial basis. If it is extended to villages, it should be profitable. Certain criteria are specified and if those criteria are satisfied, power will be supplied.”

SRI M. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—“ May I know, Sir, whether the Government propose to erect thermal stations to facilitate lift irrigation in the famine-affected areas of Anantapur and Kurnool districts? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ A separate question may be put, Sir.”

SRI B. SANKARIAH :—“ ఈ తర్రత్ ప్రేక్షకుండ్ల ఇప్పుడు వ్యవసాయానికి electricity స్పెషల్ చేయడానికి అవకాశం ఉండి కూడా, అవార పరిస్థితి గడుగు ఉండే సమయంలో ప్రభుత్వం ఎందుకు స్పెషల్ చేయడం లేదు. నెల్లూరు తర్రత్ ప్రేక్షకుండ్ల చాలా electricity waste చేస్తున్నారు. అటువంటివన్నీ వ్యవసాయానికి electricity స్పెషల్ చేయడానికి ప్రభుత్వం ఇకముందైనా చర్య తీసుకుంటారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ Sir, the Government have already been supplying power to agriculturists. But so far as last year is concerned, the Government have evolved a new policy that in respect of the rural extensions, unless the beneficiaries come forward with loans, new rural extensions should not be undertaken.”

27th July 1953]

DR K. B. MENON :—“ What is the total allotment for extension of electricity to rural areas for this year in the Five-Year Plan and what is the actual amount available? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ A separate question may be put, Sir.”

SRI K. VARADACHARI :—“ May I ask, Sir, whether power supply will be continued after 1st October in the Chittoor district? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ Yes, Sir.”

Primary schools in South Kanara.

* 1097 Q.—SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) how many villages in South Kanara district are not having even primary schools; and

(b) if so, what action the Government have taken in the matter of providing at least elementary schools to those villages?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ (a) It has been reported to Government that there are 54 schoolless villages with a population of 500 and above in the South Kanara district. No figures are available in respect of villages with a population of less than 500.

“ (b) The Government are encouraging in all possible ways the opening of schools by private agencies and by the district boards.”

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL :—“ Is it a fact that the Government have issued an order not to open new schools? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ No, Sir.”

SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI :—“ Will the Government consider the desirability of increasing the grants given to private managements and to teachers under private managements so that many aided schools may spring up? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The question of revision of grants to elementary school teachers is under consideration, Sir.”

Alleged detention of Krishnan Nayar, an auto-rickshaw driver, in Kozhikode.

* 1098 Q.—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state whether the Government have received any representation or complaints in 1953 about one auto-rickshaw driver of Kozhikode, Krishnan Nair by name, having been wrongfully detained in the Kozhikode Government Lunatic Asylum at the instance of the District Medical Officer, Kozhikode, and if so, what action has been taken against the District Medical Officer?

[27th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ Yes. The matter is under consideration.”

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—“ Has any enquiry been ordered and is it being carried out or has the enquiry concluded? I submit, Sir, that there is no point in merely saying that it is under consideration. May I know what stage of the consideration it has reached? ”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ Since the despatch of this answer, Sir, the matter has been finally disposed of. No action against the District Medical Officer or the Assistant Surgeon will be taken. The District Medical Officer has been permitted to retire.”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ In this particular case, Sir, I may submit I myself have gone to the Kozhikode Mental Hospital and found the person very sane. May I ask the Hon. Minister whether the District Medical Officers and the Resident Medical Officers are authorized by the Government to send the patient to the lunatic asylum? ”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ On account of the unruly behaviour of this person, a report was made to the police and the police took him into custody and produced him before the Subdivisional Magistrate. Under the orders of the Subdivisional Magistrate, he was sent to the Mental Hospital for observation under the Indian Lunacy Act.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Is it one of the methods of this Government to send unruly persons for observation in lunatic asylums? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Not all unruly persons.”

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—“ What is the final report and is the auto-rickshaw driver suffering from lunacy or is the District Medical Officer suffering from lunacy? ”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ He was discharged, Sir, since it was found that he was not of unsound mind.”

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—“ The Hon. Chief Minister said that not all unruly persons are sent to the Mental Hospital. Does it not mean that some unruly persons are sent to the Mental Hospital? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Some are retired and some are sent to the hospital.”

Selection to Engineering Colleges.

* 1099 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Rayalaseema students selected for Engineering Colleges for 1950-51, 1951-52, 1952-53; and

27th July 1953]

(b) what is the percentage of such selection to the total number of candidates selected for this course?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a)

Year.				Number of Rayalaseema students selected.
1950-51	..	..	..	38
1951-52	..	..	..	34
1952-53	..	..	..	45

“(b)

Year.				Percentage.
1950-51	..	..	..	10.2
1951-52	..	..	..	9.1
1952-53	..	..	..	12.0

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“Have the Government considered Mr. Justice Wanchoo's recommendations regarding educational facilities to Andhra students in the residuary State, especially with reference to the Engineering College?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“This does not arise out of this question.”

Development of roads in South Kanara.

* 1100 Q.—SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether the Government of Madras have implemented the scheme incorporated in the Vipan Scheme of Road Development in South Kanara district; and if so, how many roads have been developed?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“Yes. Forty-two out of 47 bridge works recommended in the report have been completed. The remaining five bridge works and the two road works recommended are under various stages of execution.”

SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“How many roads have been contemplated under the Vipan Scheme of Road Development in Kasaragod taluk and how many have been completed?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“Notice, Sir.”

Aid to Basic Schools.

* 1101 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state whether in granting aid to Basic Schools and Basic Training Schools all institutions are given aid on a uniform scale, and if not, why not? 9-10 a.m.

[27th July 1953]

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The grants given to Basic Schools and Basic Training Schools are of three kinds, viz., teaching grant, equipment grant and building grant. The teaching grant given to Basic Schools and Basic Training Schools is generally on a uniform scale, the scale of aid being governed by the rules relating to Elementary Schools in the case of Basic Schools and the grant-in-aid code in respect of Basic Training Schools. In exceptional cases, however, grants-in-aid are sanctioned on a more liberal scale for special reasons.

“ Equipment grant and building grants are given to Basic Schools and Basic Training Schools on a uniform scale.”

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—“ May I know, Sir, which are the institutions that are being given grants on a more liberal scale and is it not a fact that some of the institutions are being given full teaching grants while others are granted only two-thirds? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ As I had already said, four out of the thirteen basic training schools are being given full teaching grants. The four institutions are :—

- (1) Basic Training School, Gandhigram.
- (2) R.K. Mission Basic Training School, Perianaickenpalayam.
- (3) Andhra Basic Training School, Tiruvur.
- (4) Basic Training School, Kallupatti.

“ It is true that these four institutions are being granted full teaching grants, while others are being given two-thirds of the net cost and one-half of the dearness allowance of the approved expenditure. The reason is as follows :—

“ These four institutions above referred to, have been considered as pioneer institutions in the teaching of basic education. They were started well in advance before the Government came to favour basic education. They were in existence before 1948. They had to undergo a lot of difficulties due to shortage of accommodation, shortage of personnel, etc. That is why the Government are giving them full teaching grants taking into account the pioneering work done.”

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—“ Sir, is it the policy of Government to open basic schools where there are already some schools running? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Wherever there is growing need for basic schools, permission will be given.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—“ Is it not a fact that some of the basic schools are not allowed to have electricity but only kerosene lights even when electricity is available? Is it due to economy or is it to suit the basic type of the basic education imparted in the basic schools, Sir? ”

27th July 1958]

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The allegation of the hon. Member is not correct.”

SRI P. RAMA RAO :—“ దేనికీ టైటిల్స్ సూక్ష్మ శ్రమత్వం వారు గ్రాంట్లు యిచ్చేటప్పుడు, ఆ సూక్ష్మ లోని విద్యార్థులు చేసిన కనీసం సహా దింపబడ్డ ఆదాయాన్ని మూలమే శ్రమత్వం వారు లెక్కలోనికి తీసుకుంటారా? లేక, ఆ ఆదాయాన్ని అంతా సూక్ష్మ మేనేజిమెంటే అనుభవించడం జరుగుతుందా?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ It is being taken into account.”

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—“ The Hon. Minister stated that in certain special cases, liberal grants are being given. May I know what are the special cases and what are the special reasons? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I have already answered that, Sir.”

Repairs to supply channel of Yedallacheruvu, Puthur taluk, Chittoor district.

* 1102 Q.—**SRI R. B. V. SUDARSANA VARMA :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether representations have been made to the Government by the ryots to repair the supply channel of Yedallacheruvu in Puthur taluk, Chittoor district, otherwise called as Kattukomma-kalva;

(b) if so, what action the Government propose to take; and

(c) whether plans and estimates have been prepared for the work?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ (a) Yes.

“ (b) & (c) The plans and estimate for the work are ready. The Collector's report on the revenue, administrative Grow More Food and financial aspects of the scheme is awaited.”

SRI R. B. V. SUDARSANA VARMA :—“ Is it not a fact that tenders were called for and subsequently cancelled? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ I am not aware of the same, Sir. I know that the Superintending Engineer submitted estimates totalling Rs. 71,000 in respect of this scheme. We have got to look into whether the scheme will justify the large expenditure under this head.”

Patamata Pumping Scheme, Krishna district.

* 1103 Q.—**SRI T. POTHA RAJU :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Patamata Pumping Scheme at Patama village of Vijayavada firka in Krishna district has been completed;

[27th July 1953]

(b) if so, whether the said scheme is working satisfactorily; and

(c) if not, why?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) No.

“(b) & (c) Does not arise.”

SRI T. POTHARAJU :—“I am really astonished to hear the reply given by the Hon. Minister. As far as my information and knowledge go, I know that the scheme had been taken up and partially completed. The Hon. Minister may take some time but I want a definite reply to my answer.”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“I invite the attention of the hon. Member to the latter part of his own question ‘completed’.”

Elementary school teachers under the Chittoor District Board.

* 1104 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received complaints regarding irregular payment of salaries and unjust transfers of elementary school teachers working under the Chittoor District Board; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken thereon?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) No.

“(b) Does not arise.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“Will the Hon. Minister take this opportunity and see to it that the unjust transfers that are being made by the District Board President even now are put an end to?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“It has been reported that owing to administrative exigencies, the President of the District Board made certain transfers in anticipation of the approval of the District Educational Officer. Such transfers were then approved subsequently by the District Educational Officer.”

Power of transfer of employees in the Medical Department.

* 1105 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state why and when the powers of the Director of Medical Services to order transfer of employees in the Medical Department within three years were withdrawn?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“The powers of the Director of Medical Services to transfer employees of the Medical Department within a period of three years have not been withdrawn.”

27th July 1953]

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—“ Have the powers of the Director of Medical Services to order the transfer of employees within a period of three years been since withdrawn? ”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ I have already said that the powers of the Director of Medical Services to transfer employees of the Medical Department within a period of three years have not been withdrawn.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ It is now 9-15 a.m. Hon. Ministers may read the answers to the remaining questions. No hon. Member need put any supplementary questions.”

Malabar Harijan Welfare Committee.

* 1106 Q.—SRI O. KORAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) the number of members in the Malabar District Harijan Welfare Committee; and

(b) whether there is any Harijan M.L.A. in the Committee?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ (a) Eight non-officials besides a few officials.

“ (b) None of the non-officials is now an M.L.A. The reorganization of the Committee is under consideration.”

Nagavalli and Vamsadhara Projects.

* 1107 Q.—SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state at what stage the investigation of the Nagavalli and Vamsadhara Projects is?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ The investigation of the Nagavalli Project for the excavation of a right bank channel from above the Thotapalli regulator across the Nagavalli river has been completed and the plans and estimates are under scrutiny by the Engineers. The investigation of the Vamsadhara Project has been started in January 1953 and is now in progress.”

Panchayat Board libraries in Coimbatore district.

* 1108 Q.—SRI P. G. MANICKAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) how many Panchayat Boards in the Coimbatore district maintain public libraries;

(b) how many Panchayat Boards receive library grants from the Government;

(c) how many Panchayat Boards levy and collect library cess; and

[27th July 1953]

(d) whether the Government propose to take steps to direct the opening and maintenance of panchayat libraries with the aid of Government grants in all the Panchayat Boards that levy library cess?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) Forty-six.

“(b) Thirty-five.

“(c) Twenty-seven.

“(d) A proposal as mentioned in this clause is under examination.”

Completion of “Mudaliar channel” in Tiruchirappalli district.

* 1109 Q.—SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the ryots in Karur and Kulithalai taluks have been making periodical representations to the Government requesting them to complete the “Mudaliar channel” and whether the ryots have even offered to pay the entire cost of such completion in ten equal annual payments; and

(b) if so, whether the Government have investigated the matter and taken steps in the matter?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) Representations were received from the Ryots of Vangal and Kuppichipalayam villages of Karur taluk in this regard but there was no offer to pay the entire cost of the work in any of them.

“(b) The scheme has been deferred for the present by the Government.”

Thiruvadi anicut, South Arcot district.

* 1110 Q.—SRI S. RADHAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the total ayacut under Thiruvadi anicut, South Arcot district;

(b) the number of acres uncultivated in that area; and

(c) the number of acres irrigated by oil engine and electric pumpsets in that area?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“(a) Acres 5,782.

“(b) Acres 768.

“(c) Acres 995.”

27th July 1953]

Recognition of "Bhashapraveena" and "Vidyapraveena" of the Andhra University.

* 1111 Q.—SRI V. CHIDANANDAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether "Bhashapraveena" and "Vidyapraveena" of Andhra University are recognized by the State Government as equivalent to Vidwan and Siromani respectively of Madras University; and

(b) if so, whether the Government have published it in the Fort St. George Gazette?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) & (b) The qualification prescribed for Pandits and Munshis in the service of the Government other than those employed for translation work in Colleges, is a title of a University in the State in Oriental Learning. The holders of the titles of 'Vidyapraveena' and 'Bhashapraveena' of the Andhra University as well as the holders of the titles of 'Vidwan' and 'Siromani' of the Madras University are considered to satisfy this qualification. The need for the Government specially to recognize the titles of one University in the State as equivalent to those of another does not arise. The Madras University has stated that they considered the Andhra University degrees as equivalent to theirs.”

Remission of land revenue in Malabar.

* 1112 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the basis on which land revenue remission is granted in Malabar;

(b) whether any, and if so, what remission has been granted in Malabar this year on account of drought; and

(c) the extent of land, double and single crop separately, affected by drought in Malabar this year and the remission granted in each case?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“(a) In Malabar, land revenue remissions are granted under the provisions of Board's Standing Order No. 13.

“(b) & (c) An extent of 4,556.15 acres of single crop wet lands and an extent of 106.73 acres of double crop wet lands were affected by drought in Malabar this year. An amount of Rs. 39-4-0 has been granted as land revenue remission in Walluvanad taluk for the failure of the second crop raised on an extent of 23.42 acres of single crop wet lands. Granting of remission has not yet been completed in the other taluks. It will be finalised only by the end of this fasli.”

[27th July 1953]

Coringa Project, Kakinada taluk.

* 1113 Q.—SRI SAKA VENKATA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

9-20
a.m.

(a) when the Coringa Project (Kakinada taluk, East Godavari district) was begun and when it will be finished;

(b) how much land will be irrigated under this project; and

(c) of such land, how much is jirayati land, how much is Government waste land and how much is zamindari land?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) The execution of the project was started on 13th October 1951 and it is likely to be completed in all its aspects by July 1953.

“(b) A total extent of 10,250 acres is to be irrigated under the project, the first stage being 6,600 acres and the balance under the second stage to make up the above ayacut.

“(c) The distribution of the ultimate ayacut of 10,250 acres contemplated under the project under the three classifications referred to in the question is as follows :—

	ACS.
(i) Jirayati lands	8,435
(ii) Government waste lands	1,815
(iii) Zamindari lands	Nil
	10,250

“The jirayati lands shown under item (i) above belong to estate villages already taken over by the Government under the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948.”

House-sites for Harijans in Kakinada taluk.

* 1114 Q.—SRI SAKA VENKATA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any applications from Harijans of Kakinada taluk (East Godavari district) for house-sites; and

(b) whether the Government have taken any action thereon?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) Yes. Fourteen applications were received.

“(b) In five cases acquisition proceedings have been taken up and the remaining cases are under enquiry.”

27th July 1953]

Alleged leakage of question papers of S.S.L.C. Examination, 1953.

* 1115 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state whether there had been any leakage of Science, English or any other question paper of S.S.L.C. Examination of 1953, and if so, what steps the Government propose to take in the matter?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Enquiries show that there had been no leakage of question papers in the S.S.L.C. Examination, 1953. As regards the question paper in Telugu Text and Grammar of which a partial leakage at some of the centres is suspected, the matter is being investigated.”

Rate of tax for soaking fibre in Malabar.

* 1116 Q.—SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received any representation from coir workers in Malabar especially from 10 soakers of Kannankara village, Kozhikode taluk, South Malabar, requesting to cancel the enhancement of tax for soaking fibre in Government land;

(b) what is the rate of tax per cent collected for granting channels and other such places for temporary occupation for non-agricultural purposes; and

(c) what is the rate of tax collected in 1947, 1950 and 1952?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ (a) No representation was received by the Government on the subject from the coir workers or soakers of Kannankara village. They received such representations from the coir workers in certain other places in the district.

“(b) & (c)

Fasli 1357 (1st July 1947 to 30th June 1948) Pies 4 per cent or Rs. 2 per acre subject to a minimum of Re. 1.

Fasli 1360 (1st July 1950 to 30th June 1951). Do.

Fasli 1362 (1st July 1952 to 30th June 1953). As. 6 per cent or Rs. 37-8-0 per acre.”

Grant of wood to victims of fire accident in Karnata Nagepalli. Penukonda taluk.

* 1117 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that 30 villagers of Karnata Nagepalli whose houses were burnt by fire accident in 1951 in Penukonda taluk applied for the grant of wood; and

(b) if so, what action was taken?

[27th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“(a) Yes.

“(b) The victims of the fire accident were offered unclassified timber. But, the grantees did not avail themselves of the concession.”

Extension of Malampuzha irrigation scheme.

* 1118 Q.—**SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received recently any representation regarding the extension of the Malampuzha scheme to Akathothera, Puduppariyaram, etc.; and

(b) if so, what action the Government have taken on the same?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) & (b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer given to Legislative Assembly Question No. 728 (59) answered on 20th July 1953.”

Government Hospital of Indigenous Medicine.

* 1119 Q.—

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member Sri N. Gopala Menon is not in his place. The question and answer will be printed in the proceedings.”

SRI N. GOPALA MENON : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government contemplate the gradual discontinuance of the Malabar system of treatment for rheumatism and allied diseases by “dhara”, “uzhichal”, etc., in the Government Hospital of Indigenous Medicine;

(b) whether the Government have considered the desirability of levying fees from well-to-do patients who undergo such treatment in the hospital and of providing special paying wards for them;

(c) the number of patients who have availed themselves of treatment in Pancha Karma ward during the current year;

(d) the number of wards and the nurses employed in the hospital;

(e) whether there have been any complaints about the diet supplied in the hospital and about the non-availability of medicines in sufficient quantities; and

(f) whether the Government have considered the desirability of constituting an Advisory Board or a panel of honorary non-official visitors to the hospital?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) The answer is in the negative.

27th July 1953]

“(b) There are no facilities for providing special paying wards in the Hospital of Indigenous Medicine and hence the question of levying fees from well-to-do patients who undergo this treatment does not arise.

“(c) The number of patients treated in the Panchakarma ward during the current year from 1st January to 16th May 1953 was 147.

“(d) There are 12 wards attached to the Hospital of Indigenous Medicine and the strength of the nursing staff employed, is 19.

“(e) & (f) The answer is in the negative.”

Eligibility for remission of revenue.

* 1120 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether it is a fact that in the case of ryots cultivating different holdings under a single survey number, remission to none of the holdings is given if only one or two of them are held to have yielded crop above the limit of eligibility for remission?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—

“Remission is granted only when an entire survey field or a recognized subdivision thereof is left waste or when the crop on the entire area of the survey field has totally failed. It is not granted in cases where the crop on a portion of a survey field has totally failed. It is also not granted with reference to the holdings in a survey field. It may therefore happen that in respect of a survey field containing one or more holdings, remission is denied to all the holdings in the survey field by reason of the fact that the crop on the entire area of the survey field has not failed.”

Dam across the Shiriya river, Kasaragod taluk.

* 1121 Q.—SRI Y. MANJAYA SHETTY (on behalf of Sri M. S. Mogral): Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representations from the villagers of Kasaragod taluk for the construction of a permanent dam in the Shiriya river at Bombrana;

(b) whether the Government have held any investigation in the matter;

(c) if so, how far the investigation has progressed;

(d) what is the amount of the estimate for this work and what is the area that is likely to be brought under cultivation thereby; and

(e) when the execution of the work is likely to be commenced?

[27th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) & (b) The answer is in the affirmative.

“(c) The investigation has been completed. The proposal with the plans and estimate for the work are under scrutiny by the Chief Engineer (Irrigation).

“(d) These particulars are not available as the proposals have not yet been finalised and submitted to the Government.

“(e) It cannot be said now whether the scheme is likely to be commenced.”

Selection of Civil Assistant Surgeons.

* 1122 Q.—**SRI K. P. GOPALAN :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) the date on which the selection of the Civil Assistant Surgeons was last made;

(b) the number of Civil Assistant Surgeons selected; and

(c) whether any of the selected candidates have been thrown out of the original list and if so, the reasons for the same?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) The last selection of Civil Assistant Surgeons was made in October 1952.

“(b) 363 candidates were selected.

“(c) The selection of one candidate was not approved, as he was considered unsuitable for regular appointment.”

Selection of Civil Assistant Surgeons.

* 1123 Q.—**SRI C. KANDASAMI :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) how many candidates were selected provisionally to Civil Assistant Surgeons' posts in the selection held recently;

(b) of them how many candidates have been rejected finally; and

(c) what are the reasons assigned for the rejection of those candidates?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) 363 candidates.

“(b) One candidate.

“(c) He was considered unsuitable for regular appointment as an Assistant Surgeon.”

Selection of Civil Assistant Surgeons.

* 1124 Q.—**SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Public Service Commission has cancelled the selection of any candidates selected in 1952-53 for the post of Civil Assistant Surgeons in the Madras Medical Service and if so, how many;

27th July 1953]

(b) whether the Government are aware of the reasons for such cancellations by the Public Service Commission; and

(c) whether the Public Service Commission consulted the Government before the cancellation and if so, what advice was given by the Government?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) The selection of one candidate for appointment as an Assistant Surgeon was cancelled by the Commission.

“(b) Yes.

“(c) On the advice given by the Government that the candidate was unsuitable for regular appointment as an Assistant Surgeon, the Commission cancelled his provisional selection for the appointment.”

Selection of Civil Assistant Surgeons.

* 1125 Q.—**SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to State—

(a) how many were selected as Civil Assistant Surgeons by the Madras Public Service Commission recently; and

(b) how many selections out of these were subsequently cancelled and on what grounds?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) Three hundred and sixty-three candidates.

“(b) The selection of one candidate for the appointment was not approved by Government as he was considered unsuitable for regular appointment. The selection was thereupon cancelled by the Commission.”

Selection of Civil Assistant Surgeons.

* 1126 Q.—**DR. K. B. MENON :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether some candidates selected by the Service Commission in the recent Assistant Surgeon's selection were rejected by the Government;

(b) if so, for what reasons; and

(c) how were those vacancies filled up?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) to (c) The selection of only one candidate for appointment as an Assistant Surgeon was not approved as he was considered unsuitable for regular appointment. The vacancy will be filled up by the appointment of a candidate on temporary basis.”

Use of Legislators' Hostel by non-legislators.

* 1127 Q.—**SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the use of the Legislators' Hostel is allowed to anybody other than the Legislators; and

[27th July 1953]

(b) if so, on what conditions?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) The Legislators' Hostel is used primarily to accommodate Members and also to accommodate guests either of the Government or of the Legislators.

“(b) Non-Legislators will be allowed accommodation in the Hostels only when the Legislature is not in session. They will have to pay rent at Rs. 3 per head per day in the old Hostel and at Rs. 4 per head per day in the New Hostel. Guests of Legislators can be accommodated only with the consent of the other inmates of the room, and after giving intimation to the Warden. No furniture will be specially supplied to guests of the Legislators, nor can they stay in the Hostel after their hosts have vacated the rooms.”

Dam for excluding salt water in Hosdrug sub-taluk, Kasaragod.

* 1128 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have sanctioned (i) the construction of a dam for excluding salt water from entering cultivated fields at Padne village and (ii) Thimiri Reservoir Scheme in Thimiri village in Hosdrug sub-taluk of the South Kanara district; and

(b) if so, what is the extent of land to be benefited by each scheme and the cost estimated?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) No. The proposals are under consideration.

“(b) Does not arise.”

Punkah-pullers in the Highways department.

* 1129 Q.—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state how many punkah-pullers have been engaged in the State by the Assistant Engineers of the Highways department and what is the total cost incurred by Government on these punkah-pullers in the financial year 1951-52?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“One hundred and fifty-nine punkah pullers were engaged by the Assistant Engineers of the Highways Department during 1951-52 and the expenditure incurred by the Government on their employment was Rs. 40,297-11-0.”

Shroffs in Taluk offices.

* 1130 Q.—SRI Y. MANJAYA SHETTY (on behalf of Sri M. S. Mogral): Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of shroffs working in Taluk offices in the State;

27th July 1953]

(b) in how many cadres they are classified; and

(c) what is the basis on which such classification is made?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“(a) There are 312 shroffs (one II grade shroff and 311 III grade shroffs) working in the sub-treasuries in this State.

“(b) The shroffs in the treasuries and sub-treasuries are classified into three grades (grades I, II and III).

“(c) The classification of the shroffs is based upon their duties and responsibilities.”

Fee-concessions to children of acting teachers under local bodies.

* 1131 Q.—SRI K. SUBBA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state whether the fee-concessions granted to N.G.Os' children, etc., are being made applicable to the acting teachers in the Local Board Service; and, if not, whether the Government are going to issue any specific order to that effect?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“Children of acting teachers in the service of local bodies will be eligible for fee concessions provided they are appointed regularly, and not under the emergency provisions. General orders have been issued to this effect.”

Rural electrification in Kallakurichi taluk.

* 1132 Q.—SRI A. GOVINDASAMI NAYAGAR (on behalf of Sri L. Anandan): Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) why the taluk of Kallakurichi which is in the Firka Development Area, has not so far come under the Rural Electrification Programme; and

(b) when the said taluk is expected to get electricity for its towns and villages and for its agriculture?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) & (b) Although the question of extending the supply of electricity to Kallakurichi taluk was under consideration as early as 1946, power supply was found unrenumerative and had to be deferred till additional loads were canvassed. A major scheme for the supply of electricity to Kallakurichi, Thyagadurgam and Chinnasalem villages in Kallakurichi taluk, South Arcot district, has since been sanctioned. But in view of the financial stringency, the work can be taken up for execution only if contributions from the local beneficiaries are forthcoming.”

[27th July 1958]

Scarcity conditions in Tiruchirappalli district.

* 1133 Q.—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether reports have been received from the local authorities regarding scarcity conditions in certain parts of Tiruchirappalli district;

(b) if so, the taluks in respect of which reports have been received;

(c) the relief measures suggested by the District Collector; and

(d) the action taken by the Government?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“(a) Yes.”

“(b) The Collector's report was for the district as a whole.

“(c) & (d) Special remissions, postponement of collection of loan instalments and cesses and postponement of collection of unremitted kist of fasli 1361 in the affected areas have been ordered.”

Purchase of the works of any Andhra Poet or Man of Letters.

* 1134 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state with reference to answer to unstarred question No. 37, dated 25th November 1952, that instructions commending the purchase of the works of Poet Bharathi for use in all public libraries have been issued by the Director of Public Instruction, Madras; whether similar circulars have been so far issued about the works of any Andhra Poet or Andhra Man of Letters?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—“Yes.”

Dam across Agnimionshananathiyar in Alangudi taluk, Pudukkottai.

* 1135 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the proposed dam construction across Agnimionshananathiyar in Karuppathypatti-Karambakkudy Revenue vattams in Alangudi taluk of Pudukkottai Division, Tiruchirappalli district, admits of two proposals called ‘A’ and ‘B’;

(b) the details of each of the proposals A and B;

(c) the extent of acreage cultivable under each of the proposals A and B;

(d) the number of pattadars to be benefited under each of the proposals A and B;

(e) the estimated cost of each of the proposals A and B; and

(f) when any or both of the proposals will be taken up for execution?

27th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) No.

“(b) to (f) The scheme for the construction of an anicut across the Agniar near Karambakudi is under investigation by the local Public Works Department Officers with reference to the question of availability of supply, etc. Hence particulars such as cost, ayacut, etc., are not available yet and it cannot be said now whether the scheme will be taken up for execution.”

Slum improvement in the City.

* 1136 Q.—SRI A. RATHINAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Corporation of Madras applied for State aid for improvement of the slums in the City;

(b) the amount applied for and the amount sanctioned by the State Government; and

(c) what are the schemes placed before the Government as slum improvements?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) Yes.

“(b) & (c) The Corporation of Madras has applied for grants for the following slum improvement schemes :—

	RS.
(1) Improvements to slums on Government, Corporation and private lands in the City carried out by the Corporation up to the end of November 1952	4,55,000
(2) Improvements effected to the slum in Kanniappa Nagar	73,000
(3) Improvements proposed to be effected to the slums on the Government lands in Lime Kilncheri, Tiruvalluvarpuram and Palmyrah Kuppam	52,840
Total	5,80,840

“The request of the Corporation for the payment of grants in respect of the above schemes is under consideration.”

Bridge-cum-regulator over the Krishna river.

* 1137 Q.—SRI K. VENKAIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the State Government have received the approval of the estimate for Krishna bridge-cum-regulator from the Government of India; and

(b) if so, when and how the Government is going to implement it?

[27th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) No.

“(b) Does not arise.”

Extension of electricity to Chittoor district.

* 1138 Q.—SRI R. B. V. SUDARSANA VARMA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is a proposal to extend electricity from Sholinghur in North Arcot district to Palliput, Karvetnagar and Puttur in Chittoor district;

(b) if so, at what stage the matter stands; and

(c) if not, will the Government consider the scheme of such extension?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) The answer is in the negative.

“(b) Does not arise in view of the answer to clause (a) above.

“(c) Supply to Puthur is covered by a major scheme for extension of supply from Arkonam-Nagari-Kalahasti extension sanctioned by the Government in May 1951. According to a scheme sanctioned in February 1952 supply to Karvetnagar will be given by an extension from Puthur after the Puthur Sub-Station materialises and supply to Palliput will be given by an extension from Nagari. These schemes could not be taken up for execution for want of funds.”

9-30
a.m.

MR. SPEAKER :—“Now the time is 9-30. There are four more questions. We shall take up questions for five more minutes and finish them.”

Supply of electricity to Penukonda taluk.

* 1139 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHINARAYANA REDDI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to extend supply of electric power to Penukonda taluk, Anantapur district?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“A scheme for supply of electricity to Penukonda town is under consideration.”

Repairs to irrigation channels in Visakhapatnam district.

* 1140 Q.—SRI K. GOVINDA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Executive Engineer, Public Works Department of Visakhapatnam district, made a request to the Government for additional staff for carrying out repairs to and maintenance of major irrigation channels in estates recently taken over in Visakhapatnam district; and

(b) if so, whether and when the Government propose to comply with the request?

27th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) & (b) Proposals for additional staff have been received recently from the Chief Engineer and are under the consideration of the Government.”

Famine conditions in Pudukkottai subdivision.

* 1141 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether representations were made in November and December 1952, and January 1953 by the member for Pudukkottai constituency to the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue regarding the deteriorating economic and famine conditions in Pudukkottai subdivision of Tiruchirappalli district;

(b) what were the steps taken on such representations;

(c) whether the Tamil Nad Congress Committee President has made representations regarding famine conditions in the above Pudukkottai area;

(d) if so, when; and

(e) what action the Government have taken on the representations of the President of the Tamil Nad Congress Committee?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“(a) Representations made by the Member for Pudukkottai constituency in December 1952 and January 1953 regarding the deteriorating economic and famine conditions in Pudukkottai subdivision of Tiruchirappalli district were received by the Government. The representation said to have been made by the hon. Member in November 1952 was not however received.

“(b) In Kolathur and Tirumayam taluks, 44 Minor Irrigation Works amounting to Rs. 1,37,655 have been sanctioned. Action was taken by the Collector for the supply of sufficient quantity of milo and jowar to Pudukkottai division. Collection of kist was postponed till the end of March 1953 in Kolathur and Tirumayam taluks and the Collector was also directed not to take coercive steps for the collection of the arrears relating to fasli 1361 and also arrears of loans in the affected areas till March 1953. The Government did not consider it necessary to postpone the collection of kist in Alangudi taluk as requested by the Member in his representation, dated 28th January 1953. Land Revenue remission has also since been granted in the affected areas in Pudukkottai Division.

“(c) No representation from the President, Tamil Nad Congress Committee regarding famine condition in Pudukkottai area has been received by the Government.

“(d) & (e) Do not arise.”

[27th July 1953]

Copyists and examiners in the Revenue Department.

* 1142 Q.—SRI G. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the recommendations of the Board of Revenue made in its reference No. C. 8797/49, dated 8th November 1949, with reference to G.O. Ms. No. 2749, dated 25th October 1949, in respect of the revision of scales of remuneration and enhancement in the rates of copying charges to the copyists and examiners in the Revenue Department have been implemented; if not, why; and

(b) whether the copyists and the examiners of the Judicial Department were made eligible for the leave and pensionary benefits and if so, when; and why similar benefits were not granted to copyists and examiners in the Revenue Department?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“(a) In its reference No. C. 8797 of 1949, dated 8th November 1949, the Board of Revenue communicated to the Collectors G.O. Ms. No. 2749, Revenue, dated 25th October 1949 and also called for amendments to the relevant paragraphs of B.S.O. No. 173 from some of the Collectors. The reference was not intended for the Government and no recommendations were made in it requiring action by Government. Draft amendments to B.S.O. No. 173 were submitted by the Board of Revenue in 1951 with reference to G.O. Ms. No. 2749, Revenue, dated 25th October 1949, and they were approved in G.O. Ms. No. 2740, Revenue, dated 20th October 1951.

“(b) In the Civil Judicial Department the copyists and examiners of copies are of two categories—

(i) those borne on the regular establishment and (ii) others. The copyists who are on the regular establishment have been made eligible for leave and pensionary benefits with effect from 1st January 1950. The examiners of copies who are on the regular establishment are full-time Government servants and as such they are automatically eligible for leave and pensionary benefits like any other Government servant. But the other copyists and examiners who are employed from time to time to cope with the temporary increase in work are paid out of contingent funds and are not therefore eligible for leave or pensionary benefits.

“The copyists in the Judicial Magistrates' Courts and the Presidency Magistrates' Courts, Madras, were made eligible for leave and pensionary benefits with effect from 25th October 1952. But the examiners of copies in the Judicial Magistrates' Courts do not come under any service rules. The question of including them in the Madras Judicial Ministerial Service, fixing their emoluments and extending leave and pensionary benefits to them is under the consideration of the Government.

27th July 1953]

“ As regards the reasons for not extending the leave and pensionary benefits to the copyists and examiners of copies in the Revenue Department the attention of the Member is invited to the answer given to Starred question No. 304 on 5th December 1952 on the floor of this House.”

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—MOTION UNDER RULE 11 OF THE MADRAS ASSEMBLY RULES
(LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO A MEMBER).

SRI S. VENKATRAMA AYYAR :—“ Sir, I move—

‘ That, under Rule 11 of the Madras Assembly Rules, leave of absence be granted by this House to Sri V. Nadimuthu Pillai, till the 30th September 1953 from the date of his absence.’ ”

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That, under Rule 11 of the Madras Assembly Rules, leave of absence be granted by this House to Sri V. Nadimuthu Pillai, till the 30th September 1953 from the date of his absence.’

I think there is no objection to grant leave of absence. Mr. V. Nadimuthu Pillai is sick now. (After a pause.) I take it that the motion is unanimously passed.”

The motion was carried unanimously.

III.—ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS.

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ I have given notice of an adjournment motion . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member gave notice of an adjournment motion about the supersession of a municipal council. I told him in my Chamber that the District Municipalities Act provided for supersession and that the motion was out of order. Let him not again refer to it in this House.

“ The hon. Member Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu also gave notice of an adjournment motion, and I told him that it was out of order.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ Of course, you said that it was out of order. I would like to ask for a half-hour debate on the subject.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let the hon. Member give notice of a short-notice question and I will admit it.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ Sir, you have allowed the other Member to have his say. I request you to read my adjournment motion. You have given a very wrong impression about it.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have already given a ruling in my Chamber.”

[27th July 1953]

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE ANDHRA STATE BILL, 1953—*cont.**Seventh Schedule.*

* SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to make a submission. We have passed certain resolutions relating to the Seventh Schedule in regard to the apportionment of assets and liabilities. In sub-paragraph (5) of paragraph 12 of the Schedule, there is a provision for compensating the new Andhra State to the extent of 2.30 crores (two hundred and thirty lakhs of rupees) towards the cost of construction of new Capital and for compensating what is said to have been lost by the Andhras by reason of their losing Madras City. This provision is very different to the resolutions already adopted in regard to assets and liabilities. What is proposed Sir, is only an ex-gratia payment to the new Andhra State to build its Capital and the residuary State has been called upon to pay this sum. Therefore, Sir, I submit that this provision of the Seventh Schedule should be considered and this Assembly should express an opinion on it for the guidance of the Central Government. I have tabled an amendment suggesting the deletion of this sub-clause. Similar amendments have been given notice of by other Members. I request you, therefore, Sir, to take this up.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ If the hon. Member wants to move the amendment, I have no objection.”

SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMI :—“ Sir, I move—

‘ 251 *In the Seventh Schedule, sub-paragraph (5) of paragraph 12 shall be deleted.* ’ ”

The amendment was duly seconded.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, may I submit that the provision of a sum to the Andhra State as a compensation for the relative shortage of buildings is covered by the two resolutions with regard to the division of assets and liabilities already passed by this House? This also will be one of the questions which will be taken into consideration by the Commission. In fact, we also could have suggested amendments. When we passed those resolutions, we thought that whether the sum should be one crore, two crores, eight crores or ten crores should be left over to the expert commission, which will take all things into consideration and make the apportionment. Even the provision made in the Seventh Schedule is made having regard to certain considerations. I submit that this is covered by the two resolutions already passed and I do not think it will be right for us to reopen matters day after day like this.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ If we take up one particular provision after the passage of the two resolutions by this House, I think there will be a demand for taking up so many other provisions also. On the question of buildings itself, so many amendments have been tabled.”

27th July 1953]

* SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMI :—“ Sir, I do not agree with the arguments put forward by Messrs. Viswanatham and T. Nagi Reddi. This provision for the payment of compensation of Rs. 2-30 crores has been introduced in the Seventh Schedule, probably based on the recommendation of Justice Wanchoo. It is wrong and incorrect to claim any compensation in respect of buildings in Madras City. The residuary State is being asked to pay nearly 2-30 crores. The rights of the citizens of Madras and the people of the residuary State must be considered before any decision is taken.”

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—“ I do not know, 9-40
Sir, wherefrom Mr. Ramaswami got the idea that it refers to a.m.
the City of Madras. It is not stated there. It refers to buildings all over the State. I think he has misunderstood the provision. This is one of the provisions in the Seventh Schedule. If we take up his amendment, we will have to take up the entire schedule and recast it.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, there was a point in our opposing this amendment. The point was that we must have an over-all picture of the situation in the division of assets and liabilities or giving a set-off. If we take it bit by bit the over-all picture would be lost. We will have a lop-sided opinion on this side or that side. Suppose certain equitable considerations prevail in regard to clause 12 of the Seventh Schedule, then this particular clause might receive a particular treatment. Suppose on the other hand this clause receives another kind of treatment, the figure in the clause would change. Therefore, all the questions must be taken together. There is no point in taking items one after another. That is why, we submitted that the whole matter should be referred to a committee, which taking all factors into consideration, might make an equitable distribution and give an equitable set-off. That is the reason why we oppose re-opening this matter not merely on technical grounds but also on grounds of commonsense.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, this is a general question. We must examine this from the general point of view. I wonder if Mr. Viswanatham is practising in courts now. He has a special way of pleading. I very well see that. I was watching the discussion on division of assets and liabilities and it appeared to me at that time that they wanted not to go into the principles but to leave the whole question—not only minor details but the very basic principles of the division of assets and liabilities—to a committee to be appointed. That resolution was carried, as has been mentioned. But the present question, as far as it appears to me, on the face of it, is a creation of a new liability—not a division of existing liabilities or existing assets. It is a creation of a new liability in the name of set-off or compensation. It is imposed upon the whole of the residuary State. I think it is a basic question which is not covered by reference to an expert committee for the division of

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [27th July 1953]

assets and liabilities. I can understand the division of assets and liabilities being made by an expert committee. But the question whether help to the Andhra Government to build its own new Capital should be given by the Government of India or should be imposed as a liability on the residuary State, is a slightly different question. I do not mind the whole thing being postponed. The question is that they (the Government of India) have asked us to give our opinion. Are we to give no opinion on this vital matter practically leaving the entire thing to a commission to be appointed?"

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am sorry, Sir, I cannot agree with the Hon. the Chief Minister. He really ought not to have (though he has a perfect right to do so) intervened. He need not have intervened at this stage."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"This seems to me to be a different question."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, the Hon. the Chief Minister says that this is a new liability, and the Government must come to the Legislature for an opinion whether the Government of India should bear the burden or whether the Madras State should bear the burden. May I refer him respectfully to the provisions of the Sind Order and Orissa Order? The committee for apportioning the share of burden decided the shares. It was the committee that decided who should bear which burden. You will find in the Orissa Order that the burden was apportioned between Orissa and India. In the Sind Order you will find 'this is the burden of the Government of India; this is the burden of Sind, and this is the burden of Bombay'. A committee was appointed before, and then certain decisions were taken. Those decisions were embodied in the order. That was the spirit in which we said that all these matters should be referred to a commission. We have already passed two resolutions. To-day, if we say that this is a new liability upon the residuary State, I am sorry I cannot agree to that. It is part of the liability and part of the asset. If you read sub-clause (5), you will find the following words, 'In order to compensate the State of Andhra finally for its relatively smaller share of buildings its share in the liability on account of debt to be apportioned between the States of Andhra and Madras . . .'. This has got a direct relation to the division of assets and liabilities. It is not as if it is a new matter. I do not think, Sir, I can make matters more clear. The language is clear. The intention is clear. The decision of the House taken on the two previous resolutions has made matters very clear. Therefore, I would request the Chief Minister not to introduce unnecessary complications now."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Sir, if the matter had stopped with the first resolution, and we passed that resolution that the Finance Commission should go into the matter and decide the whole division of assets and liabilities, perhaps, the

27th July 1953] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

arguments advanced by Mr. Viswanatham may be a little bit valid. But unfortunately we did not stop there. We went further and expressed an opinion that there should be a division of all assets and liabilities according to the population ratio. That is contained in amendment No. 126. In moving and explaining that amendment, Mr. Hanumantha Rao made it clear that that would not apply to buildings and institutions in the City, and that in regard to the question of Capital, a different principle would apply. As a matter of fact, when we discussed amendment No. 126, I was inclined to think that that would not cover the entire assets and liabilities. Even the hon. Member Mr. Hanumantha Rao wanted to exclude buildings in regard to compensation. Apart from all these things, paragraph 12 (5) is a very important one in regard to payment of compensation. I will straightway answer my friend that this clause refers to all buildings. After all, this figure of Rs. 230.4 lakhs is arrived at from Mr. Justice Wanchoo's formula. Mr. Justice Wanchoo has taken this from the Partition Committee's report. The Partition Committee's report refers only to buildings in the City. That is why the hon. Member Mr. Ramaswami is right in referring to buildings in the City. It is not as if something new is stated to-day. This has got something to do with Mr. Justice Wanchoo's recommendation. Therefore, I think this should be discussed, and our view should be expressed."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, without entering into any dispute, I must say that if this was their view, they should have raised objection when we were discussing the general proposition with reference to the appointment of a committee or on the one to decide matters on the population basis. When the two concerned resolutions were discussed, neither the Leader of the House nor the Hon. the Chief Minister nor Mr. Ramaswami stated 'this must be excluded from our discussion'. We had no notice that this amendment would now be moved. All of a sudden, we are asked to re-open a matter which was decided, not once but twice. I submit to you, Sir, with all respect that we must pay some regard to the rules of procedure that are followed here."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member Mr. Ramaswami wants to explain."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"This is not a different question. We made a reference to the Seventh Schedule, and then the resolution was passed. This will be very clearly seen, Sir, if you see the language used in amendment No. 114. The words used there are 'assets and liabilities dealt with in the Seventh Schedule'. The objection now raised could have been raised then. It was open to them to raise this objection. They did not."

MR. SPEAKER:—"They want to take this as a separate resolution."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"How can they take it so? Are we not to follow the procedure, here?"

[27th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ If they want, they can take it as a separate resolution.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I object to this, Sir. After this is over, can I also come with another request saying ‘ let me deal with clause 3 as a separate proposition ’. It is wrong to do so. We must follow some procedure. That is why I said, Sir, . . . assets and liabilities dealt with in the Seventh Schedule ’. It is because I wanted to have an over all picture so that all matters can be considered. It is only when we consider all matters in one complete set, we will understand whether the provisions of lump sums or of proportions are large or small. Then only we can come to the conclusion that this is a large or small matter. In the over-all picture before the Commission, the Commission may increase or decrease the figure, if they think it necessary. The whole matter is left to the Commission. We passed the resolution, not once but twice. The Commission has got to come. We discussed this resolution two days before. Now on the third day, if an hon. Member should say ‘ we shall re-open the matter,’ I say it is very clearly out of order. This is not a different proposition, because this proposition is . . . (Interruption.) I cannot enter into any further dispute. If I have not convinced you or the Hon. Minister so far, I cannot convince him or you by any further arguments.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member Mr. Nagi Reddi will now speak, and then I will put this question to vote.”

9-50
a.m.

* **SRI T. NAGI REDDI** :—“ If this is to be taken into consideration, I believe there are a number of other things also in this Bill which have to be reconsidered. For example, there is the question of pension.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ We are discussing the question of liabilities and their division.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ Here also it is a question of division of liabilities.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ If the hon. Member wants to raise any other question, we shall consider it later.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ Let us go clause by clause into the Schedule.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Whatever the hon. Member wants to be taken up, we shall take up later.”

* **SRI T. NAGI REDDI** :—“ I would like the Seventh Schedule to be taken up from the beginning, because when we go into a particular item in the Schedule, we must remember that there are other portions also on the basis of which allocations of assets and liabilities have been made. Therefore, when we consider one particular question, we have to consider the other questions also. Otherwise, it will be unnecessary and unreasonable to consider any item in the Seventh Schedule, because

27th July 1953]

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

we have already passed a Resolution stating that the whole question should be decided by a Financial Commission. If it is a question of discussing any particular issue, let us go step by step. Let us go clause by clause and decide the whole question. Every clause, however small it may be, is based on the previous clause and, therefore, the whole thing should be considered together. There is no question of saying that each clause is separate by itself. That is exactly what should not be the case. That is why I said in the whole of my speeches on Saturday that if we were to take up one clause, we should take up all clauses. Otherwise, we should leave the whole question to a Financial Commission. If it is a question that a particular clause should be deleted, then the Financial Commission should be approached. If it is a question that I should have Rs. 100 crores, then I should go to the Financial Commission. If we were to discuss the whole thing, then we should be discussing the whole basis of the division of assets and liabilities. Then only we will arrive at the proper basis for the decision whether we should have Rs. 2 crores, or Rs. 3 crores, or Rs. 10 crores. It is not simply based on air. Hence, I would say that this question be discussed in full or be left to the Financial Commission."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"Whether the Financial Commission is going to come or not is quite a different thing altogether. It is a question for Parliament to decide. But here the Assembly will not be doing its duty if it does not express its opinion on such an important clause as this. I respectfully submit this should be discussed, our views expressed on it and a decision taken."

MR. SPEAKER :—"After finishing this, we shall take up other questions."

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"The Hon. Sri Subramaniam has said that we do not know whether the Financial Commission is going to come or not. That is a different matter. I also do not know whether the Financial Commission is going to come or not. If we are to consider the matter in that light, then is it not in the interests of the House that, when we are doubtful whether the Financial Commission is going to come or not, we should sit and discuss the whole of the Seventh Schedule, clause by clause? If we are to proceed in that particular argumentative manner, then it becomes very essential for every Member of this House to get at as many facts as possible regarding the items mentioned in the Schedule so that we may consider the Seventh Schedule as a whole. I submit, Sir, if we are to consider this matter, then we should have much more time than what we have got. Every clause is an important clause. We are going to decide the fate of certain people and we are going to divide the State. We will have to decide it on the basis of certain facts and not in the air. My contention is that if we are to go into one part of the Seventh Schedule, it becomes essential for us to go into the whole of the Schedule."

[27th July 1953]

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"The point is this. We have discussed the Seventh Schedule and taken a decision by means of the Resolution of the hon. Member Sri Viswanatham that was passed. If we were to accept the contention of the Hon. Sri Subramaniam, it means that we begin to reopen the whole question. Then what about the Resolution which we have already passed? How is it consistent with our discussion here?"

MR. SPEAKER :—"This is a separate entity."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"It is not so, Sir. It has some relation to the Seventh Schedule. That Schedule was disposed of the other day. How can we take it up again?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"Anyhow, the Speaker has allowed the Resolution. The only question is whether any other question should be taken up. If it is raised properly, we shall discuss it."

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—"On a point of order, Sir. I beg to point out that any discussion on the Seventh Schedule which is purely an appendage to clause 46 will be totally irrelevant. I beseech the Chair to overrule any discussion on that because it is not at all relevant, having been superseded by the Resolution of the hon. Member Sri Viswanatham which has been carried."

MR. SPEAKER :—"This is a separate entity. Let the House give a verdict on it."

*** SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—**"The point is whether we should not follow certain rules of procedure. I am submitting to you, Sir, it is not a matter of accommodating me or Sri Nagi Reddi by saying, 'If I allow this, I shall allow that also.' But, do we follow any procedure? Shall you say that the matter has been closed? Or, shall you say, 'I will allow you also?'. If you should say the latter, then where is the end to all these discussions. What is our programme? Members must have a reasonable expectation of what is going to happen and what is not going to happen. I mentioned in my resolution all the matters dealt with in the Seventh Schedule. Therefore, this discussion should not be allowed again to-day. I appeal to the Chair that it should not be allowed. There is no question of accommodating me or anybody else. But we must accommodate the rules of procedure. We must follow some procedure, and we must have a reasonable expectation of what is likely to come up and what is not likely to come up. The present one is not a different matter at all from what we have discussed. We raised the point of shortage of an asset in a particular State. To meet that point, provision has been made that a certain amount will be specially allotted. It was this Government that included that particular clause in the particular Schedule. To-day to say that it does not form part of assets and liabilities is somewhat strange. It is very wrong of them to say

27th July 1953] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

so. It is doing us in the eye at an unexpected moment. I strongly protest against this matter being reopened and I submit it is out of order."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" Sir, apart from the technicality of the whole thing, I would like to remind the Hon. the Chief Minister in this connection about the understanding we had when we were discussing the Capital issue the other day. I made a suggestion to the Chair and the Hon. the Chief Minister also made a suggestion that the Seventh Schedule need not be taken up and that the Capital issue could be separated from that and discussed. On this understanding, the entire House discussed the Capital issue. Now to bring it again before the House is not proper. Only on the understanding that discussion on the Seventh Schedule was closed, we discussed the Capital issue. When the understanding was like that, to reopen the question is not proper. I hope the Hon. the Chief Minister will agree to my suggestion."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, the only consideration urged by the hon. Member Sri Hanumantha Rao is this. Because we took up the question where the Capital should be, he infers that there was an understanding at that time that no other question unconnected with the Capital and connected with moneys should be considered. I am not aware of any such understanding. If my memory is wrong, we might look up the papers and the statements made. The fact that the Capital issue was an important question weighed with us in saying that it should be examined. We did not negatively rule out by that process all other matters, even if important. That would be a wrong construction put on what was said. 10 a.m.

" Apart from all that, I am sorry that so much heat has been generated merely on a matter of technicality on which the Chair should finally give a ruling. On the merits, I would appeal to hon. Members, apart from the question of technicality, to consider this. The whole question was considered complicated because it was a question of division of assets and liabilities. On the ground of its being a complicated matter fit for expert opinion—although we might differ and hold a different opinion as to who should give final orders, whether it should be Parliament or a Commission—it was considered that it was a matter eminently fit for examination by a Committee. We should interpret the resolution of the House on that basis. There was a difference of opinion and there was a majority vote on the question whether the Commission's order should be final in the matter and whether Parliament should have nothing to do with it. So far as that question goes, it is closed.

" Then, the Opposition went further and notwithstanding the previously passed resolution that the question of the division of assets and liabilities should be referred to a Commission, notwithstanding the definite opinion that had already been reached, they discussed the question fully and elaborately and wanted a decision of the House, and opinions were taken from all view-points as to

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [27th July 1953]

whether the assets and liabilities should be distributed on a population basis. Now, the Opposition has had the advantage of not only getting a vote on the question of appointment of a Commission to decide all principles but a further decision that the Commission should accept a principle, namely, that the assets and liabilities should be divided on population basis. Now, if that most important deviation from a reference to the Commission as a whole would be legitimate, surely a question which has nothing to do with the existing liabilities is also a matter for consideration.

"Member after Member rose and said, 'You may go to the Commission and argue the matter.' There is no question of argument; the Assembly cannot go to the Commission and argue the matter. Evidence may be taken by the Commission, not by the Assembly. The Bill has been referred for the opinion of the Assembly on various matters. The view has been expressed that the question of division of assets and liabilities should be referred to a Commission. Does it debar the Assembly from giving an opinion on the provision in the Bill that the construction of a new Capital for the Andhra State, in place of Madras, which has been the Capital of the State as a whole, should be a charge upon the residuary State to a certain extent? Has the Assembly no right to express a view on that point? I submit, Sir, on merits it is certainly an important matter. The Commission would say, 'What is it that we should do? What is the view of the Assembly on this matter?' Should we keep the Commission in a vacuum, when it should come to operate, on a matter which is not at all included in the question of division of assets and liabilities? As to the manner in which the division should be made, it has been decided that it should be on a population basis. The hon. Member Sri Viswanatham referred to a previous division where the capital liability was laid on the residuary State in respect of building of a Capital, without reference to the Legislature. There was no question of Legislature then."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"The matter was not taken to the Legislature. It was taken to a Commission and then the Governor-General passed an Order. That was a most reasonable thing."

"The Hon. the Chief Minister said that this was a new liability. I submit it is a question concerning assets. What is an asset to one will not be an asset to another. Therefore, in order to compensate the other party, certain amount has been provided. I think we have made our position, in substance as also on technical grounds, very clear. If, in spite of this, you, Sir, are pleased to allow a discussion upon this, all that I can say is that, without any sense of disrespect to the Chair, I and those of us who are thinking along with me will not participate in the debate upon this question."

MR. SPEAKER :—"I have allowed this motion."

27th July 1953]

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ Sir, I also would make my position clear. I have said a number of times that we could not go through the whole question unless we possess certain facts and unless there is a Committee. The House having accepted the two major principles on which we should go through the whole question, the position as it exists now is as per the resolution of Sri Viswanatham. Therefore, we too agree with Sri Viswanatham, and refuse to participate in this debate.”

[At this stage, all the Andhra Members and a large number of Members of the United Democratic Front and Praja Socialists walked out of the House.]

* SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMI :—“ Sir, I feel there is considerable confusion on this issue. The Resolution passed by the Assembly reads as follows :—

‘ This Assembly is of the opinion that all types of assets and liabilities, unissued stores, articles, goods and various funds including depreciation reserve funds be divided between Madras, Andhra and Mysore States in proportion to the population of Madras and Andhra States and of the territory transferred to Mysore State.’

“ This Resolution relates to the division of assets and liabilities in proportion to the population. There is no reference at all to the question of payment of any compensation in respect of the buildings in the City of Madras, or for the construction of a new capital for the New Andhra State. Any *ex gratia* payment to the New Andhra State, cannot be a liability of the residuary State. Mr. Justice Wanchoo says in his Report (paragraph 89, page 33)—

‘ The Partition Committee provided for a lump-sum adjustment of 1 crore rupees for the new State in order to compensate it for buildings in Madras City which are being used for all State purposes. The manner in which the provision was made in the assets and liabilities statement which has been copied in Annexure IV, has deprived the New State of Rs. 36 lakhs out of this, and that will have to be corrected. It appears that the book value of buildings in Madras City which served the whole State is Rs. 320.24 lakhs. This figure should also be doubled in order to arrive at a fair value of these buildings for purposes of adjustment. The value would thus come to Rs. 640.48 lakhs and the share of the New State would come to Rs. 230.4 lakhs.’

Sir, the whole basis of Justice Wanchoo’s recommendation is arbitrary and there is no reality about it. The people of Madras are being asked to pay for building the new Capital of the Andhra State. I think it is wrong. If we are to analyse the list of buildings that have been tabulated on page 97 of the book, ‘ Formation of Andhra Province ’, we will find that the assets in Madras City have been divided into three categories, A, B and C—

A—Buildings serving Provincial common needs, such as High Court Buildings.

B—Important Residential Buildings like Adyar House, Presidency Hostel.

C—Specialized Institutions like Government Museum, Law College.”

SRI C. PULLA REDDI :—“ I want to know whether the Chair has given its decision on this question.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have given my decision and the hon. Member has been allowed to speak.”

[27th July 1953]

* SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMI :—“ In view of what I have said, I feel justified in reopening this question and all Members should express their opinion as to whether any compensation should at all be paid in respect of the buildings in Madras City. A number of common buildings used for administrative purposes in Madras City have been built out of the surplus funds available from Madras City itself and not out of any surplus arising from the Andhra area. Moreover most of these buildings came into existence in the days of the John Company and the Nawabs of Carnatic, i.e., long before the Circars or the Rayalaseema were added on to the Presidency of Madras. By no stretch of imagination can it be assumed that any of the buildings in Madras City were built with Andhra money. Therefore, there is no justice at all in paying any compensation much less an *ex-gratia* payment.”

SRI K. T. KOSALRAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, இந்த காம்பன்சேஷன் எஞ்சியுள்ள சென்னை ராஜ்யம் கொடுக்கப்படவேண்டியது அவசியமா என்பதைப்பற்றிய விதிக்கு நானும் ஒரு திருத்தம், அதாவது 12-வது பாரகிராப்புக்கு, அதை எடுத்து விடவேண்டும் என்று, கொடுத்திருக்கிறேன். இந்தத் திருத்தம் அவசியமா அல்லது அவசியம் இல்லையா என்பதைப்பற்றி கனம் டி. விசுவநாதம் அவர்களும் இன்னும் மற்ற கம்யூனிஸ்ட் நண்பர்களும் பேசினார்கள். ஆனால் ஒரு தீர்மானத்தை பாஸ் பண்ணிவிட்டால் ”

SRI B. KRISHNAMOORTHY ROW :—“ On a point of order.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ There is no point of order.”

SRI K. T. KOSALRAM :—“ Sir, இந்த மசோதாவின் ஒவ்வொரு பாரகிராப்பையும் நாம் தீர்மானிக்க வேண்டிய அதிகாரம் இந்த சபைக்கு இருக்கிறது. இந்த சபைக்கு இருக்கின்ற அதிகாரத்தை இந்த சபைக்கு அதிகாரம் இல்லாமல் செய்யவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லுகின்ற வாத்தத்தை கனம் சபாநாயகர் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாததற்கு சபையின் சார்பாக நான் அவருக்கு நன்றி செலுத்துகிறேன். இந்த காம்பென்சேஷன் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று இதற்கு முன்னால் கனம் பிரகாசம் அவர்கள் இருந்த பார்ட்டிஷன் கமிட்டியில் ஒரு கோடி ரூபாய் மட்டும் தான் கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று சொன்னதை அந்த மந்திரி சபை போட்டிருக்கிறது. அதை அனுசரித்து ஸ்ரீ வாஞ்சனின் ரிப்போர்ட்டில் கூட ஒரு கோடி ரூபாய் தான் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று இருக்கிறது. ஆனால் இந்த மசோதாவில் இரண்டு கோடி 35 லட்சம் ரூபாய் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று போட்டிருப்பது கூடாது என்றதான் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். கனம் பிரகாசம் பேசும்போது எஞ்சியுள்ள சென்னை யாருக்கும் சொந்தம் இல்லை என்று சொன்னார். எஞ்சியுள்ள சென்னை என்பது தமிழர்களுக்கு மட்டும் அல்ல என்பதை அவர்கள் சொல்வது மட்டும் அல்ல, நானும் சொல்லுகிறேன், சென்னை எல்லோருக்கும் சொந்தமானது. பிரகாசம் சென்னை நகரில் இப்பொழுது இருக்கிறார். அவரை இங்கு வைத்துக்கொள்வதற்கும் நாங்கள் தயாராக இருக்கிறோம். ஆனால் எஞ்சியுள்ள சென்னை காம்பன்சேஷன் கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று சொல்வதைமட்டும் நாங்கள் ஒத்துக்கொள்ளமாட்டோம். இங்கு வெள்ளைக்காரர்கள் கம்பெனியால் கட்டிய கட்டடங்கள் எல்லாம் அப்படியே இருக்கின்றன. அவைகளுதான் அதிகமாக இருக்கின்றன. இவைகளுக்கு காம்பென்சேஷன் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்றால் அதற்கெல்லாம் மத்திய அரசாங்கம்தான் கொடுக்கவேண்டும். அப்படி இல்லாமல் எஞ்சியுள்ள சென்னை ராஜ்யம்தான் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொல்வது மிக மிக தவறு. இந்த மசோதாவில் அதைப்பற்றி சொல்லியிருக்கவேண்டிய அவசியமில்லை. எஞ்சியுள்ள சென்னை மாகாணம் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொல்வது எஞ்சியுள்ள சென்னை ராஜ்யத்தின் துர்ப்பாக்கியம்தான். அத்துடன் தமிழர்களுடைய வோட்டுகளை வாங்கி வந்து கம்யூனிஸ்ட் மெம்பர்களும் தமிழ் நாட்டைக் காட்டிக்கொடுக்கும் முறையில் பேசுகிறார்கள்.”

27th July 1953] [Sri K. T. Kosalram]

இதைக் காணும்போதுதான் என் மனம் அஞ்சுகிறது. இத்தகைய நிலைமையில் இது மட்டும் அல்ல இந்த நிலைமையில் பேசினால் ஆந்திராவில் கம்யூனிஸ்ட் ராஜ்யம் வந்துவிடும். எந்தக் காலத்தில் பங்கு டீபாட்டுக் கொள்ளலாம் என்று அவர்கள் நினைத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவ்விதம் நினைத்துக் கொண்டிருப்பது மிகவும் கோழைத்தனம் என்று தான் நான் சொல்லுவேன். எஞ்சியுள்ள சென்னை ராஜ்ய மக்கள் தங்களுக்கு இந்த கம்யூனிஸ்ட்கள் துரோகம் செய்கிறார்கள் என்று நிச்சயமாகத் தெரிந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதைத் தோழர்களுக்கு நான் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இந்த மசோதாவில் இரண்டு கோடி 30 லட்சம் ரூபாய் கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று சொல்வது சரியல்ல. அதை எஞ்சியுள்ள சென்னை மாகாணத்தலிருந்து கொடுக்கக்கூடாது. மத்திய அசாங்கத்தினடமிருந்து வாங்கக்கொள்ளட்டும், அதைப்பற்றி அக்கறை இல்லை. இந்தத் தீர்மானம் மிக மிக அவசியமானது. இந்த மசோதாவினுள்ள 12-வது பாரகிராப்பை எடுத்துவிட வேண்டும். இதை எல்லோரும் ஆதரிப்பார்கள் என்றே நினைக்கிறேன். இதை நிச்சயமாக ஆதரிக்கவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை அனுமதித்துப் பேசுவதற்கு அனுமதி கொடுத்த கமைசபா நாயகர் அவர்களுக்கு என்னுடைய நன்றியை மறுபடியும் தெரிவித்துக்கொண்டு இத்தகைய முடிவாகக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the amendment of hon. Member Sri K. T. Kosalram. We must understand that the buildings and other things which are situated in the City of Madras and the Residuary Madras State as a whole form part and parcel of the Residuary State. It is not fair on the part of the Andhras to ask for a compensation in respect of these buildings. If they want any compensation, it is just that they ask the Central Government to pay it. By this amendment, we only seek to assert our rights and any compensation for these buildings will not come in a graceful manner. Therefore I submit that this clause relating to compensation may be deleted and the rest of the Seventh Schedule may be accepted.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ Sir, the question is a very simple one. As a matter of fact, the Seventh Schedule itself makes a distinction between the assets and liabilities and the buildings as such. If you will kindly refer to paragraph 12, you will find that a clear distinction has been made. This is what sub-paragraph (3) of paragraph 12 says:

‘For the purposes of the allocation under sub-paragraph (2) of this paragraph—(a) only expenditure on assets for which Capital accounts have been kept (excluding the Buckingham Canal and any buildings for which such accounts have been kept) shall be taken into account . . .’

“ Thus they have made a distinction with reference to the assets and liabilities and buildings have been completely excluded from them. That is why we have a separate provision with reference to buildings. So there is no use of simply saying that buildings also come under assets and liabilities and as we have already discussed assets and liabilities question, we should not discuss the question of buildings now. I say they are completely dissociated from each other. It is not as if they form the assets and liabilities. They are treated completely on a different footing. That is why the hon. Member Sri Hanumantha Rao was laying so much stress on his amendment No. 126. He said that assets and liabilities did not include so many other things which he has mentioned in his amendment. He knew well that assets and liabilities did not include

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[27th July 1953]

everything. That is why he was laying great stress on this point and demanded Rs. 4 crores for the purpose of building the Andhra Capital. Even in apportioning liability, Public Debt, etc., these buildings are not taken into consideration at all. It is said separately that a sum of Rs. 230.4 lakhs has to be paid by the Residuary Madras State. Now we have got to decide whether it is proper to saddle the Residuary State to the extent of Rs. 230.4 lakhs in order to compensate the Andhra State for its relatively smaller share of buildings. We must note that only revenue yielding assets are taken into consideration for division and all other assets are not taken into account. Assets and liabilities have got a certain connotation. Buildings as such are not assets, because they are not revenue-yielding assets. For instance, take the Government Museum. It is not only not revenue-yielding, but it is a liability on us. We have to maintain that building. If you take the list of buildings, which they have taken into consideration, you will find that there are many buildings which are not even used for official purposes in the sense that offices are not located there. There are certain other institutions which are used not only by the Government, but all the citizens. Even outsiders and foreigners are entitled to use them. Thus they are common institutions. Whether any compensation in respect of the buildings used for these institutions has got to be paid or not is a moot point. That is why I say that this House should express an opinion on this moot point. Whoever be the authority—whether it is Parliament or some other independent authority—that goes into the question, must know the views of this Assembly on this question. Then only they can come to a proper decision on this point.

“We must now see how this figure of Rs. 230.4 lakhs was arrived at. We must consider this in the background of the Partition Committee's report which has dealt with this matter in an attitude of compromise. In an attitude of compromise, when there was a sum of Rs. 42 crores in the Revenue Reserve Fund at that time, considering the difficulties of the Andhras in putting up a Capital they said that out of this Rs. 42 crores one crore should be allotted to the Andhras before division. When one crore of rupees was allotted to the Andhra State before division, we have to consider the actual contribution of the Residuary State. Its liability is restricted. Instead of dividing this one crore of rupees between the Andhra State and the Residuary Madras State, it was agreed at that time that Rs. 66 lakhs, that is roughly two-thirds of the sum of Rs. 1 crore, which is the share of the Residuary Madras State, may also be given to the Andhra State. We must note that it was at the time of the Partition Committee when we had Rs. 42 crores in the Revenue Reserve Fund. But, what is the position now? We have spent the entire amount of Rs. 42 corers. Where and how we have spent that sum is a bit relevant in this connexion.

“If we take into account what has been spent out of the Revenue Reserve Fund and also the loans raised subsequent to 1946, we have spent not 36.25 per cent of these on the Andhra area to which they are entitled on the basis of population. The actual expenditure in Andhra area comes to about fifty per cent.

27th July 1953] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Out of the money from the Reserve Fund, we have spent more money in the Andhra area. We have incurred a lot of public debt and on whom has this money been spent and in what ratio? So, Sir, even when we had 42 crores of rupees in the Revenue Reserve Fund, we promised to pay only 66 lakhs. Now we are asked to pay 230 lakhs. It is nearly four times more than what we agreed to then. Is it fair? Sir, it will be a little bit relevant to know how this 230 lakhs has been arrived at. I can understand if buildings which are now used for quartering offices in this State are taken into account, if at all we are liable to pay any compensation even in lieu of them. I have already said that it is a very wrong principle to ask for compensation in respect of buildings put up on a grand scale by the British companies and the British Government. For example, take the High Court buildings. We are asked to pay compensation for those buildings. Would we ever put up such costly things if we knew that at a future date, we would have to separate and, therefore, we would have to pay compensation? The British Government in their own interests—in the interests of British judges—wanted to have a comfortable building and so put up a building on that scale. So also, the Fort St. George and the Board of Revenue buildings. They were constructed on a grand scale on a par with British glory. They were intended to make the British officers comfortable and not for providing amenities to the people. So, now if we are asked to pay compensation in respect of not only residential buildings and buildings where our offices are housed but for every conceivable building in the Madras City, it is not fair. There is the Museum; there is the General Hospital. It is not as if they are revenue yielding buildings. The General Hospital does not bring in any revenue. We have to spend huge sums of money for the purpose of maintaining it and for running the hospital. It certainly does not benefit the Government, so to say, to the extent of a pie. Let us take the Partition Committee Report. At page 97, a large list of buildings is given which includes the Government Museum, Law College, Technology and Trade Schools, Government Hospitals for Women and Children, Government Ophthalmic Hospital, Veterinary College, Mental Hospital, Government Tuberculosis Hospital, Presidency College, Teachers' College, the new Engineering College, Guindy and every conceivable building. If we exclude all these buildings, the value of the remaining buildings where Government offices are housed, comes to 86 lakhs of rupees. Even if we double that figure as proposed by Justice Wanchoo it comes only to Rs. 172 lakhs. So granting that we are liable to pay compensation in respect of buildings, we may have to pay only Rs. 60 lakhs. Therefore, on what basis this 236 lakhs has been arrived at is a little bit strange to me. It is for the House to express an opinion on this question. I wanted merely to give out facts relating to the basis on which the figure of 230 lakhs has been worked out. It is most unfair to take all buildings in the City of Madras into account, assess their book value and then double it and claim one-third of it as compensation. I agree, Sir, that the Andhra State has to build its own capital. For that purpose, should the liability be saddled on the Residuary State? If a State is being formed,

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [27th July 1953]

if the Government of India have taken a decision—(the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari : ‘ At their instance and not at our instance ’)—yes, at the instance of Andhras and if that separation is considered vital and the Andhras have any claim, they have to make that claim on the Central Government. They must ask the Centre, ‘ give us some money for the purpose of putting up a capital in view of our poor financial position.’ That is a quite different question altogether. But to throw the liability on the residuary State to the tune of nearly 230 lakhs is unjust, inequitable and not warranted by any precedent at all. When Pakistan was formed, were costly buildings in Delhi taken into account for payment of compensation? Did they raise any point about buildings put up when the country remained one and undivided? No such point was made. So also, when Sind was separated from Bombay, did they ask for compensation in lieu of buildings in Bombay? After all, in Bombay there are much more costly buildings than in Madras. Then, when Orissa was separated was any compensation paid by the Madras State to the Orissa State? That being the case, to bring in a new principle when the Andhra State is formed, is, in my humble submission, unjust. We cannot afford to be saddled with such a huge liability when our financial resources are also not bright. Under these circumstances, Sir, I feel that the House must express an opinion on this matter.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I am going to put Mr. Rajam Ramaswami’s amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ In the Seventh Schedule, sub-paragraph (5) of paragraph 12 shall be deleted.’ ”

The amendment was put and carried, the non-Andhra Members who were present voting for the amendment.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ In view of the importance of the issue, I would like to know how many have voted for the amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ You want a poll? I shall ask those who oppose the amendment to stand. We can know the number. Hon. Members who oppose the amendment will please stand in their places.”

[No one stood up.]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ No hon. Member opposes the amendment. All support it.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Now that the Seventh Schedule is completed, shall we go back to clause 38 which refers to transfer of proceedings from the Madras High Court to the Andhra High Court? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ If there are no more amendments to the Seventh Schedule, we shall take up the Eighth Schedule first, finish the Schedules and then go back to clause 38 and other clauses left over.”

27th July 1953]

SRI K. ADIKESAVALU NAIDU :—" Sir, I have got an amendment, Amendment No. 262. I move—

10-30
a.m.

' Add at the end the following paragraph :—

" (20) The areas in Chittoor district of the Andhra State now served by electricity produced from Mettur Electricity Project (Southern grid) shall be continued to be so served on the existing terms and conditions. Further, the Madras State should supply sufficient power from the Mettur Electricity Project to the Andhra State for all the schemes that are investigated and sanctioned but not executed before the appointed day." ' ' "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion falls through for want of a seconder. We will take up the Ninth Schedule. All members who have given notice of amendments are not here, and nobody is moving any of those amendments."

The discussion on the postponed clauses 38, 41 and 49 will now be taken up.

Clause 38.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I have an agreed amendment to sub-clause (2) of clause 38. We may take that up with the members present in the House. I move—

' This House recommends that " sub-clauses (2) and (3) of clause 38 may be recast so as to give effect to the following propositions :—

- (1) Out of the appeals, applications for review, revision petitions, application for leave to appeal, writ petitions and other proceedings pending in the High Court of Madras, such appeals, applications for review, etc, as, in the opinion of the Chief Justice of Madras and the Chief Justice-designate of Andhra should, having regard to the place of accrual of the cause of action and other material factors, be heard and decided by the High Court of Andhra, shall, on the said Chief Justices passing an order to that effect, stand transferred to the High Court of Andhra. No such order may be made after the expiry of six months from the prescribed day.
- (2) The High Court of Madras shall, notwithstanding sub-section (1) of section 38, have, and the High Court of Andhra shall not have, jurisdiction to entertain appeals, applications for review, applications for leave to appeal, including leave to appeal to the Supreme Court and other proceedings seeking relief in respect of judgments, decrees and orders passed by the High Court before the prescribed day. Such proceedings may, after they are

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[27th July 1953]

entertained, be included in the order or orders passed by the Chief Justice of Madras and the Chief Justice-designate of Andhra under paragraph (1) and shall accordingly stand transferred to the High Court of Andhra. No such order may be made after the expiry of six months from the prescribed day.'

"Sir, this is only with reference to transfer of pending cases from the Madras High Court to the Andhra High Court after the prescribed date. This is more or less an accepted formula."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—"Sir, I want to know whether the proposed amendment refers only to review, writ petitions and other petitions or to second appeals and first appeals also."

10-40
a.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"Sir, proceedings pending in the High Court at Madras with reference to Andhra area shall be transferred to the Andhra High Court, taking into account the accrual of cause of action, etc. With reference to Letters Patent Appeals, because they are appeals against the judgment of the High Court itself, the Government of India Bill says these appeals should be disposed of by the same High Court. After all, only Judges of the Madras High Court are going to be there in the Andhra High Court also; then why not the Judges who are being transferred from the Madras High Court dispose of such appeals in the Andhra High Court? But after the prescribed day some appeals may have to be filed because of the recent judgments and orders and we have said that in respect of these the filing should be done in the Madras High Court and they will be transferred to the Andhra High Court if they concern only the Andhra State."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The question is—

'This House recommends that "sub-clauses (2) and (3) of clause 38" may be recast so as to give effect to the following propositions : (1) Out of the appeals, applications for review, revision petitions, applications for leave to appeal, writ petitions and other proceedings pending in the High Court of Madras, such appeals, applications for review, etc., as in the opinion of the Chief Justice of Madras and the Chief Justice-designate of Andhra should, having regard to the place of accrual of the cause of action and other material factors, be heard and decided by the High Court of Andhra, shall, on the said Chief Justices passing an order to that effect, stand transferred to the High Court of Andhra. No such order may be made after the expiry of six months from the prescribed day.

(2) The High Court of Madras shall, notwithstanding sub-section (1) of section 38, have, and the High Court of Andhra shall not have jurisdiction to entertain appeals, applications for review, applications for leave to appeal, including leave to appeal to the Supreme Court and other proceedings seeking relief in respect of

27th July 1953] [Mr. Speaker]

judgments, decrees and orders passed by the High Court before the prescribed day. Such proceedings may, after they are entertained, be included in the order or orders passed by the Chief Justice of Madras and the Chief Justice-designate of Andhra under paragraph (1) and shall accordingly stand transferred to the High Court of Andhra. No such order may be made after the expiry of six months from the prescribed day.' "

The amendment was put and carried, the non-Andhra Members who were present voting for it.

Clause 41.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, this is an amendment in respect of the transferred territory of Bellary district. I move—

' This House recommends that " sub-clauses (1) to (3) of clause 41 " may be recast so as to give effect to the following proposals :—

- (1) The jurisdiction of the High Court of Mysore shall extend in the whole of the transferred territory with effect from the appointed day, and subject to propositions 2 and 3 below, the jurisdiction of the High Court of Madras shall cease on that day in relation to the transferred territory.
- (2) Out of the appeals, applications for review, revision petitions, writ petitions and other proceedings pending in the High Court of Madras, the Chief Justice of Madras shall prepare lists from time to time of appeals, etc., which, having regard to the place of accrual of the cause of action and other material factors, should, by reason of the transfer to the State of Mysore of the territory specified in sub-section (1) of section 4, be heard and decided by the High Court of Mysore. The Chief Justice of India shall order the transfer of appeals, etc., included in the said lists to the High Court of Mysore. No such transfers shall be made after the expiry of six months from the appointed day.
- (3) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) above, the High Court of Madras shall have, and the High Court of Mysore shall not have, jurisdiction to entertain appeals, applications for review, applications for leave to appeal and other proceedings seeking relief in respect of judgments, decrees and orders passed by the High Court of Madras before the appointed day. Such appeals, etc., may, after they are entertained, be transferred by the Chief Justice of India in exercise of power stated above before the expiry of six months from the appointed day.
- (4) Judgments, decrees, etc., passed by the High Court of Madras in relation to the transferred territory at any time before the expiry of six months from the appointed day shall have effect as judgments, decrees, etc., passed also by the High Court of Mysore.

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [27th July 1953]

(5) *The existing explanation to the section should be omitted.*

Sir, this is with reference to the transferred territory of Bellary district. With reference to the transferred territory, the Mysore High Court gets jurisdiction even on the appointed day instead of on the prescribed day in the case of the Andhra High Court."

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—" Sir, in the case of Mysore, are we to understand that the Madras High Court has power to deal with appeals till the expiry of six months after the appointed day? In the case of filing new appeals against judgments made by the Madras High Court immediately prior to the appointed day, should they be filed in the Mysore High Court or in the Madras High Court? In respect of writ applications and other revision petitions, are they automatically transferred on the appointed day or should they be transferred by the Chief Justice or any authority concerned after the appointed day within six months? "

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Six months is only the period within which the order should be passed so that it may not go on indefinitely. But, in practice, as Mysore has got a ready made High Court functioning even before the appointed day, we say that all these appeals, etc., pending will be kept ready and transferred to the Mysore High Court on the appointed day or soon after that by an order of the Chief Justice of India. But some judgments might have been delivered just before the appointed day with reference to which appeals, or review petitions or petitions for leave to appeal, have to be made. In all these cases, we are laying down that, because they relate to the judgments of the Madras High Court, they will again be scrutinized whether they can be disposed of by the Madras High Court or sent to the Mysore High Court. In the case of review petitions, the rule is that the judge who gives the judgment should hear the review petition. So, even though it may be a matter relating to purely transferred territory, it may be decided that the review petition should be disposed of by the Madras High Court. Therefore, Sir, in respect of appeals, revision petitions, etc., entertained after the appointed day, they will be gone into and orders passed whether they should be transferred to the Mysore High Court or retained in the Madras High Court."

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—" Sir, just now I heard the Hon. Finance Minister saying that after the appointed day the Madras High Court shall cease to have jurisdiction and the Mysore High Court shall have jurisdiction over all these matters. On and from the appointed day the Madras High Court becomes *functus officio* and I want to know how the Madras High Court can deal with revision petitions, etc."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" The Madras High Court becomes *functus officio* only in respect of cases which are pending and have been transferred. But in the case of an appeal

27th July 1953]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

which has been disposed of, it is not pending if it is re-opened by a review petition or by another appeal in which case it shall not go to the other High Court because this re-opening by way of appeal or revision petition or leave to appeal to the Supreme Court, can be done only in the Madras High Court. Therefore, these cases will be again scrutinized whether they should be transferred to the Mysore High Court or retained in the Madras High Court."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' This House recommends that " sub-clauses (1) to (3) of clause 41 " may be recast so as to give effect to the following proposals :—

(1) The jurisdiction of the High Court of Mysore shall extend in the whole of the transferred territory with effect from the appointed day, and subject to propositions 2 and 3 below, the jurisdiction of the High Court of Madras shall cease on that day in relation to the transferred territory.

(2) Out of the appeals, applications for review, revision petitions, writ petitions and other proceedings pending in the High Court of Madras, the Chief Justice of Madras shall prepare lists from time to time of appeals, etc., which, having regard to the place of accrual of the cause of action and other material factors, should, by reason of the transfer to the State of Mysore of the territory specified in sub-section (1) of section 4, be heard and decided by the High Court of Mysore. The Chief Justice of India shall order the transfer of appeals, etc., included in the said lists to the High Court of Mysore. No such transfers shall be made after the expiry of six months from the appointed day.

(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) above, the High Court of Madras shall have, and the High Court of Mysore shall not have, jurisdiction to entertain appeals, applications for review, applications for leave to appeal and other proceedings seeking relief in respect of judgments, decrees and orders passed by the High Court of Madras before the appointed day. Such appeals, etc., may, after they are entertained, be transferred by the Chief Justice of India in exercise of power stated above before the expiry of six months from the appointed day.

(4) Judgments, decrees, etc., passed by the High Court of Madras in relation to the transferred territory at any time before the expiry of six months from the appointed day shall have effect as judgments, decrees, etc., passed also by the High Court of Mysore.

(5) The existing Explanation to the section should be omitted."

The amendment was put and carried, the non-Andhra Members who were present voting for it.

[27th July 1953]

Clause 49.

10-50 THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Mr. Speaker, for the
a.m. benefit of hon. Members I shall read what this clause says: It is as follows :—

'The provisions of sections 46, 47, 48 and 54 and the Seventh Schedule shall have effect subject to any agreement between the States concerned and shall be deemed to have been modified in accordance with such agreement:

Provided that every such agreement if it affects the rights or liabilities of any person other than Government shall be published in the Official Gazette of the States concerned.'

This clause is not necessary. After moving for its deletion, I shall explain. Sir, I now move—

'That clause 49 be deleted.'

MR. SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

'That clause 49 be deleted.'

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I have moved for the deletion of the clause because I think that it will lead to a lot of difficulties and there will be no finality to matters. According to clause 49 it is open to anybody to say 'Let us re-open this case. Let us discuss this matter'. In reality that particular matter would have been already disposed of. But still it would be persisted and if this clause is there, it gives room for any Government to do so. For instance we have provided and the House had given a verdict that for all matters connected with the division of assets and liabilities, an Expert Commission may be appointed. Even after the Expert Commission has finished its enquiry and supposing say, it says that Andhra shall bear this much liability and Madras shall bear this much, some from the Andhra side may butt in and say, in view of the power given under this clause, 'No, no. We cannot bear this much of liability. Let us discuss that matter in detail again'. That is how even settled matters would be re-opened. There will be no finality. That is why I have moved for its deletion."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'That clause 49 be deleted.'

The amendment was put and carried, the non-Andhra Members who were present voting for it.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I shall now move certain new clauses to be added after clause 49—

New clauses after clause 49.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I move—

'The following clauses should be added as separate clauses at the end of Part V of the Bill :—

"(i) Expenditure in respect of any liability as between the States of Madras, Andhra and Mysore arising under or by reason of any provision of this Act or of any order made thereunder shall be expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State of Madras or the State of Andhra or the State of Mysore, as the case may be."

27th July 1953]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

“(ii) If immediately before the appointed day, the State of Madras is liable as guarantor in respect of any liability of a co-operative society which is registered under the Madras Co-operative Societies Act (Madras Act VI of 1932) and whose area of operations is limited to the whole or part of the territory specified in sub-section (1) of section (3) of this Act, then, as from the appointed day, the said liability of the State of Madras shall cease, and the State of Andhra shall be liable as guarantor in respect of the said liability of the said society, and expenditure in respect of such liability of the State of Andhra shall be expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, inasmuch as the two amendments require some explanation, I shall take a few minutes. We have provided previously in the Bill that the liabilities outstanding against us in the residuary area shall be borne by us and those outstanding against the Andhra area shall be borne by them. Suppose we have got to pay up to two crores of rupees for Andhra, say . . . ”

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—“ May I know what is the alternative suggested by the Government for clause 49, in view of the fact that the same had been deleted now? ”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ I forgot to mention one particular point while moving for the deletion of clause 49. I would invite the attention of the hon. Member to paragraph 19 of the Seventh Schedule. It says—

‘ That the benefit or burden of any assets or liabilities not dealt with in the foregoing paragraphs or in section 47 or section 48 shall be apportioned between the State of Madras and the States of Andhra and Mysore in such manner as the President may by order direct.’

So, in respect of all other matters not specifically covered in the Bill in respect of division of assets and liabilities between Andhra, Madras and Mysore, the President shall have the final say. He will apportion the assets and liabilities by his order. So far as the principle of division of assets and liabilities is concerned the House had already given its verdict saying that an Expert Commission will be appointed to go into all the questions concerning the division of assets and liabilities. The Expert Commission will cover all points covered in the various clauses of the Seventh Schedule. So we see in either case either the President or the Expert Commission is there to decide. Then, where is the need for clause 49 which only tries to re-open settled issues and create bitterness? That is why I moved for its deletion.

“ I shall now explain further why I have moved the two amendments which will stand as new clauses. Let us take the case (I am taking a hypothetical issue) wherein we have got to pay Rs. 2 crores, say to Andhra. How are we to pay it? We have to pay it only from the Consolidated Fund of the residuary State. Similarly suppose Andhra has got to pay Rs. 2 crores to us. It has to pay only from the Consolidated Fund of Andhra. But can we

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [27th July 1953]

withdraw any amount from the Consolidated Fund? The express permission of the Legislature has got to be obtained. It is perfectly open for the Legislature to either accept or reject the demand. The Andhra Legislature may say : ' No, no, we cannot accept this liability under a particular head. So we reject this demand.' Then how could the residuary State be paid? Of course there are certain items which could be paid directly out of the Consolidated Fund without taking a vote of the concerned Legislature. For instance, salaries of High Court Judges, charges payable to the Public Service Commission, the charges the Government has got to pay as interest on public debts—for all these items a vote of the Legislature and an appropriation law is not necessary. But suppose a contingency arises wherein the Andhra Legislature refuses to discharge its liability to the residuary State after division. What are we to do? That is why this amendment becomes necessary. The first amendment says—

' (1) Expenditure in respect of any liability as between the States of Andhra, Madras and Mysore, arising under or by reason of any provision of this Act or of any order made thereunder, shall be expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State of Madras or the State of Andhra or the State of Mysore as the case may be.'

" I shall now explain the need for the second amendment I have moved.

" We have the Land Mortgage Bank in our State. We have the Central Land Mortgage Bank here in Madras. We have also the State Co-operative Bank. These institutions are common institutions. They have lent money to the tune of several crores throughout the State to agriculturists. Of course, they have taken mortgages of properties for the money they had lent. On the security of these mortgages, debentures have been raised. It is only the debenture money that has been distributed as loan. These debentures are granted by the State. What is to happen when this State is divided into two units, Andhra and Madras? Under the Co-operative Societies Act and the Land Mortgage Banks Act, the Registrar of Co-operative Societies has been given sufficient powers to recover the loans. He need not go to a court of law, obtain a decree and then execute it. The Registrar can straight-away bring the property to sale. After separation, there will be a separate Registrar of Co-operative Societies for Andhra. The jurisdiction of the present Registrar will not extend to Andhra. Then how is he to recover the loans granted to all those in the Andhra area before separation, inasmuch as his jurisdiction may not extend to Andhra? He himself cannot go, execute a decree and recover the loans in Andhra. That is why this second amendment has been inserted. By this amendment a provision is made by which in respect of all liabilities pertaining to Andhra for which the State of Madras has stood as guarantor, that State shall from the appointed day cease to be the guarantor and the State of Andhra shall begin to function as the guarantor. The liability of the State of Madras shall cease from the appointed day and the same shall be borne by the State of Andhra. Similar is the case with reference to State Co-operative Banks. The guarantees with respect to Andhra shall become the sole concern of the State of

27th July 1953] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Andhra from the appointed day. The State of Madras shall function as the guarantor only in respect of liabilities pertaining to the residuary Madras State.

"So, even in respect of those things, that is, in respect of moneys which are solely to be within the Andhra area that guarantee should be taken over by the Andhra Government as such, the residuary State being responsible for the other share. That is No. (ii). Therefore, we are making a provision that the liability shall be treated as expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State. These are the only two provisions which we have to make."

11-0
a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER :—"The question is—

'The following clauses should be added as separate clauses at the end of Part V of the Bill:—

"(i) Expenditure in respect of any liability as between the States of Madras, Andhra and Mysore, arising under or by reason of any provision of this Act or of any order made thereunder, shall be expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State of Madras or the State of Andhra or the State of Mysore, as the case may be.

(ii) If, immediately before the appointed day, the State of Madras is liable as guarantor in respect of any liability of a co-operative society which is registered under the Madras Co-operative Societies Act (Madras Act VI of 1932) and whose area of operations is limited to the whole or part of the territory specified in sub-section (1) of section 3 of this Act, then, as from the appointed day, the said liability of the State of Madras shall cease, and the State of Andhra shall be liable as guarantor in respect of the said liability of the said society, and expenditure in respect of such liability of the State of Andhra shall be expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State."

The amendment was put and carried, the non-Andhra Members who were present voting for it.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"With reference to the list of Scheduled and Backward Classes, I promised to examine and find out whether one item was in the list and whether it had been wrongly omitted. I have verified and found that it is not in the list. It is not open to us now to include or exclude any community in the list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes."

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—"One of the Backward Classes 'Reddi (Ganjam)', as found from the list maintained by our Government under rule 92 of the Madras Educational Rules, was for a very long time enjoying educational concessions. This community has been removed from the list. I would like to know whether these communities were removed under the advice of our Government at the time of drafting this Bill."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"There was a reference made to this subject the other day but without giving the name of any particular community. To-day the hon. Member gives

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[27th July 1953]

the name of some particular sub-community. I presume the hon. Member does not mean that all Reddis should be classified as backward, but that some particular class called 'Reddi' but having another name also to specify should be so classified. If the matter is given to us specifically, I shall look into the matter."

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—" I wanted to bring to the notice of the Government one instance of removal of a backward community. But another hon. Member has complained about some other communities. We are not anxious that as many communities as possible should be included. But once they were included and were enjoying the concessions, I would like to know the special reasons for their removal."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I am afraid that we cannot go into this matter when we are discussing the Bill. If any particular community has been removed wrongly, the matter has to be raised elsewhere. A Commission has been appointed to go into the question of Backward Classes. I do not think it is possible now to say why it has been removed."

* SRI A. RATHINAM :—" கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்தத் தமிழ் நாட்டிலே சேலம் ஜில்லா, கோயமுத்தூர் ஜில்லா, திருச்சி ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு பகுதி, மதுரை ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு பகுதி ஆகிய இந்த இடங்களில் கொங்கு வாடான் என்ற ஒரு ஜாதிக்காரர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் கல்லியில் மிகவும் பிற்போக்கான நிலையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். அதுமட்டுமல்லாமல் மற்ற எந்தத் துறையிலும் பிற்போக்கான நிலையிலேயே இருந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களையும் பிற்போக்கு இனத்தவர்களின் ஜாதி தாவில் சேர்க்க முடியுமா ? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" அதற்காக ஒரு தனி கமிஷன் போட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதனிடம் நீங்கள் உங்கள் யோசனையைச் சொல்லுங்கள். பல கேள்விகள் நிறைந்த தான் அனுப்பப்பட்டிருக்கிறது."

SRI A. RATHINAM :—" எனக்கும் அந்தத் தான் வருமா ? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" எல்லா எம்.எல்.ஏ.-க்களுக்கும் அனுப்பப்பட்டிருக்கிறது."

Clauses 2 and 1 and the Long Title.

Clauses 2, 1 and the Long Title were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" There are certain amendments which do not relate to any specific provisions in the Bill but are of a general nature like the amendment relating to the Andhra University Act. The hon. Members who walked out may be called in formally."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have sent word to them."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I beg to move—

'That the proposed Andhra State Bill, 1953, having been considered fully and approved, this House is of the view that the Bill should be amended on the lines indicated in the opinions and resolutions approved by the House.'"

27th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the proposed Andhra State Bill, 1953, having been considered fully and approved, this House is of the view that the Bill should be amended on the lines indicated in the opinions and resolutions approved by the House.' "

The motion was put and carried, the non-Andhra Members who were present voting for it.

V.—NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

MR. SPEAKER :—" We shall now take up non-official business."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I wish to state that in the situation that has arisen rather by surprise, I do not think it will be proper for me to take up the discussion of the Modified Elementary Education Scheme at this stage when so many hon. Members are absent."

A. Bills.

(1) THE MADRAS PROHIBITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953.

SRI V. GOPALA GOUNDER :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1953." 11-10 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I shall read the relevant rules—

' 76. (1) If a motion for leave to introduce a Bill is opposed, the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the member who moves and from a member who opposes the motion, may, without further debate, put the question thereon.

(2) If such a motion is agreed to, the Bill shall be deemed to have been introduced.

77. As soon as may be after leave to introduce a Bill has been granted, the Bill shall be published in the Gazette.' "

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, I understand the object of the Bill. But I think that the shape is misconceived. The object is to make a change in the Criminal Procedure Code in respect of prosecutions under the Prohibition Act. Under the Criminal Procedure Code, statements of certain kinds are not admissible as evidence such as statements made in confession. The hon. Member wants to introduce a provision in the law under which statements of a different class of people also should not be taken as admissible in cases of prosecution under the Prohibition Act. I think the object in view can be achieved only by an amendment of the Criminal Procedure Code. After explaining this, I leave the matter at that. The hon. Member may take advice and do whatever he likes.

" I have no objection to the introduction of the Bill."

[27th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That leave to introduce the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be granted.’ ”

The motion was put and carried and leave granted.

SRI V. GOPALA GOUNDER :—“ I introduce the Bill.”

(2) THE MALABAR AGRARIAN RELATIONS BILL, 1953.

* SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—“ Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce the Malabar Agrarian Relations Bill, 1953.”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ I oppose the motion, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ After a brief statement from the mover and the opposer, I will put the motion to vote.”

* SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Bill for whose introduction I am seeking the leave of this House is conceived for the benefit of the ryots of Malabar, certain taluks of South Kanara and one taluk of the Nilgiris district. The object of the Bill is to see that the agrarian relations are so readjusted as to produce a contented class of people who will be more interested in agriculture and thereby increase the productivity of the land in the country generally and in Malabar in particular. It is a matter of common knowledge for the Members of this House that in Malabar for long there has been an agitation by the tenant class, particularly the cultivating tenant class, for equitable rent and for some kind of fixity of tenure in respect of their holdings. The Bill contains certain provisions altogether new for giving statutory effect to the cherished desire of the tenants. The Hon. Minister has adopted the unusual procedure of opposing the introduction of the Bill. It is only fair that the House should be given an opportunity to consider the Bill in detail and reject it if it is found unsuitable. To forestall the decision of the House and to oppose even the introduction of the Bill is certainly a novel, unusually extraordinary and unprecedented course for the Hon. Minister to adopt. On former occasions when this House had to consider certain taxation Bills, some Members raised objection even to granting leave for introduction. The Hon. Speaker then pointed out that this course was unusual and rarely adopted, because normally the House must be given an opportunity to discuss the provisions and then reject the Bills if necessary. The House will have an opportunity of discussing the Bill only if leave for introduction is given.

“ The Hon. Minister has introduced a Bill for amending the Malabar Tenancy Act. If leave is granted, there will be two Bills side by side, one very progressive and attractive and the other somewhat retrograde. If the real object of the Minister is to see that the two pictures are not presented side by side, I beg to submit this. The Malabar Tenancy Amendment Bill is of a very minor nature and it can hardly satisfy the people. It has already raised serious

27th July 1953] [Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar]

discontent, as you may be aware from the big *jathas* that were organized as a protest against it. Mere patchwork amendments to that Act can hardly satisfy the people of Malabar. So I have brought forward a Bill which embodies several original features. The existing Malabar Tenancy Act was conceived and passed in 1929, and about twenty-five years have passed since then. There is hardly any use in reconstructing, amending, polishing or doing any patchwork repair to that Act. What was thought to be fair in 1928 or 1929 will hardly be thought justifiable to-day. During these years, there have been considerable changes in agrarian outlook and thought. The responsibilities of the State in protecting the tenant class have been fully appreciated in a Welfare State. We of this Welfare State are thinking of giving protection to the tenant classes in a wider measure and with a larger outlook."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The rule is that the statement should be a brief one."

* SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—" The main features of my Bill are as follows. Firstly the cultivating tenants will be given absolute or almost absolute protection in respect of their holdings. Secondly it makes provision for a fair rent which will be really fair as against the provision in the existing Act. Although the present rent is euphemistically called fair rent, it is really exacting. Thirdly my Bill provides for the cultivating classes buying up the rights of the landlords by paying the consideration due either in a lump sum or in instalments as the court may decide and becoming peasant proprietors. Another provision in the Bill is with regard to eviction. Eviction is a common feature in Malabar, and as I pointed out during question hour this morning, three thousand and odd eviction suits were filed in the Court in the course of a month. The main feature of the Bill is to see that eviction is made as difficult and unattractive as possible and virtually confer fixity of tenure upon the tenants.

" Then, another important matter is to see that the waste lands 11-20 a.m. now owned by landlords and not cultivated by them are compulsorily made available for cultivation by cultivators who are willing to take up cultivation of such lands. So, the four primary features are, (1) conferment of fixity of tenure, (2) reduction of the existing high rents and bringing them in proportion to notions of fairness, (3) allowing cultivating tenants to buy up the landlord's rights and (4) making available waste lands for cultivation. I might mention in passing that the Malabar Tenancy Amendment Bill, which has been introduced by the Government, does not touch any of these major propositions. It has just glanced over a few matters only. It can hardly be called satisfactory. So, a comprehensive Bill, which will consolidate the law regarding agrarian relations, and which will progressively bring into harmony the existing notions among the various classes of people in Malabar, is necessary. That is the object of my Bill. It can hardly be said that there is no alternative to the present amending Bill introduced by the Government. Hon. Members can take it from me that this Bill is no parallel or rival to the Bill which has

[Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar] [27th July 1953]

already been introduced by the Government. It has only attractive provisions. These may not influence the opinion of the Members of the House against the Bill. With the object of vetoing the Bill, this kind of objection has been personally taken by the Hon. Minister even at this stage."

* THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" Sir, I oppose this motion because of special circumstances. You know that introducing such Bills is the task of the Government, because the Government have to meet expenses from the funds of the State. The subject of Malabar Tenancy was taken up by the Government as early as 1930, and special modifications have been resorted to by Government by amendments to the Act. Recently an amending Bill was introduced in this Assembly, and it is now pending discussion before the Joint Select Committee. Legislation involving the exercise of Government functions and expenditure of Government funds should properly be undertaken by Government. This is the cardinal principle obtaining in all parliamentary practice. That is why, Sir, I am opposing this motion. There are many instances where private Bills were not allowed to be proceeded with in similar circumstances in the British Parliament. I may be permitted to quote two instances in which such Bills were not proceeded with. In 1887 notices were given of a private Bill for settling a scheme of arrangement for the Turkish loans of 1854, 1855 and 1871, but its subject was obviously not one to be dealt with by a private Bill, and so it was not proceeded with. Another instance was in 1900. On the second reading of a private Bill promoted by the Metropolitan Water Companies, Mr. Speaker called the attention of the House to the large and important powers which were proposed to be conferred by it upon a public department, viz., a local Government board, and which, according to the practice of the House, ought to be secured by a public rather than by a private Bill. The Bill was accordingly withdrawn. As I submitted, the funds for enforcing the provisions of the Bill will have to be found from the consolidated fund. For instance, in clause 10 (g) of the Bill, it is stated that every panchayat board and every municipal council shall cause to be maintained, in the prescribed manner, a record of rights in respect of every holding, ulkudi, and kudiyruppu, within their respective territorial limits. You know, Sir, that municipal councils and panchayats cannot afford, in the present circumstances, to discharge any of these functions. Ultimately the Government will have to give them the money for complying with the provisions of this Bill. Apart from this provision, there are several other clauses of the Bill, namely, clauses 10 (b) (i), 11 (i), 14 (b), 23 (i), 24 and 38, which impose additional duties on Revenue officers and on courts in connexion with various matters such as the determination of fair rent, adjudication of disputes between the landlord and the tenant in connexion with the payment of rent, purchase of lands by the tenant and the enquiry into petitions for assignments of arable waste lands. The performance of these duties will necessitate the appointment of additional staff and this will involve increased expenditure from the consolidated fund of the State. Clause 38, expressly provides for

27th July 1953] [Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair]

the payment of compensation by Government to the parties whose rights are adversely affected. The compensation payable by the Government will have to be met from the Consolidated Fund of the State. Several provisions of the Bill, I am sorry to say, are not clear. Most of the clauses have to be recast. The Bill is to be re-arranged. You know, Sir, that it may not be profitable for the Legislature or for the public to spend much of their time in scrutinizing this Bill. Moreover, Sir, you know that this is a parallel legislation. Most of the provisions reiterated in this Bill are contained in the existing statute. The proper procedure would have been to bring in an amendment to the amending Bill. All these things can be discussed and scrutinized at the Joint Select Committee meetings. In these circumstances, Sir, I am compelled to oppose this Bill at this stage. In ordinary circumstances, I would not have opposed it. The peculiar circumstances obtaining now warrant that I should oppose this Bill. I will be failing in my duty if I do not oppose the motion. With these words, Sir, I oppose the motion of the hon. Member Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar."

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification I want to make a very brief statement. The Hon. Minister in his objection to leave being granted for introducing my Bill, was stressing the fact that it involved expenditure from the consolidated fund of the State. There are two distinct stages in the Constitution, to which I would invite the attention of the Hon. Minister. The first stage is the grant of leave to introduce a Bill in the House. When the Bill is to be considered by the House clause by clause or in greater detail, touching the consolidated fund of the State, it would be necessary to obtain the Governor's recommendation for the discussion of the Bill. Therefore, this argument cannot be used as an objection or a veto at this stage. The question of consolidated fund of the State does not come here now. Here it is a case where the House has got to see whether the extraordinary step of granting leave for introducing this Bill should be taken. This is a highly extraordinary step. This should be distinct from the other stage, namely, expenditure out of the consolidated fund of the State. That is a matter for the Governor to consider and not for the Assembly. The Hon. Minister need not usurp the powers of the Governor or indicate any suggestion that Governor's recommendation shall be taken. It is for the private Member to wait upon the Governor and persuade him to give the recommendation. The two stages must be kept separate. The second stage need not be brought in here to confuse the issue. Secondly, the expenditure from the consolidated fund of the State is very small and insignificant. I was listening to the Hon. Minister when he referred to the consolidated fund of the State. The way he referred to the fund suggested that the consolidated fund of the State would be drained by this Bill. Absolutely little more expenditure than is incurred at present is covered by this Bill."

[27th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That leave be granted for the introduction of the Malabar Agrarian Relations Bill, 1953.' "

11-30 p.m. The motion was put and declared lost. A poll was demanded. and the division bell was rung.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I understand that the Hon. the Chief Minister has no objection to the introduction of the Bill."

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" We have no objection, Sir, to the introduction of the Bill."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. Chief Minister wants to say something. As a special case, I shall allow him. I hope the House will not mistake it."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The Government having introduced a Bill, a Joint Select Committee having been appointed and as the thing is going on and the present Bill is in substance an amendment to that Government Bill, the Government decided to oppose the introduction of the present Bill. But if the hon. Member still desires that it should be introduced, the Government have no objection."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That leave be granted for the introduction of the Malabar Agrarian Relations Bill, 1953.' "

The motion was put and carried and leave was granted.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—" I introduce the Bill."

(3) THE MADRAS AGRICULTURISTS' RELIEF (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg leave to introduce the Madras Agriculturists' Relief (Amendment) Bill, 1953."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

' That leave be granted for the introduction of the Madras Agriculturists' Relief (Amendment) Bill, 1953.

" I want to know what the Government want to say on this matter."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" In the first instance, I am constrained to oppose the motion, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I shall allow the hon. Member to make a brief statement and the Hon. Minister to speak afterwards. Then, I will put the motion to the vote of the House."

* SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—" Sir, I thought at least this was a non-controversial Bill. Seeing what has happened to the previous Bill, I am really surprised to see that the Hon. the

27th July 1953] [Sri M. Narayana Kurup]

Revenue Minister should oppose this Bill. It is a simple one-clause Bill. When the present Chief Minister was the Head of the State in 1938, he introduced the first Agriculturists' Relief Act to give protection to agriculturists in a period of depression. But in the working of that Act, it was subsequently found that many of the benefits conferred upon the people by that enactment were taken away by the interpretation put upon some words and phrases by the Courts. In effect, on account of the interpretation put upon the phrase 'rate of interest on debt', possessory mortgages or mortgages with possession were completely excluded from the purview of that Act and the required benefit did not accrue to the agriculturist. Therefore, in 1949 an Amending Bill was brought forward making it applicable to mortgages with possession. Thereby a new section 9-A was incorporated and under that section a new clause was introduced saying that the Act would apply to possessory mortgages and that a mortgagee in possession for a period of thirty years and more was bound to restore the land to the original mortgagor without payment of any mortgage money. In other words, it enacted that the mortgage amount would be deemed to have been discharged if the mortgagee were in possession for thirty years and more. This Act applies to the whole State. But curiously enough, by one sub-section, certain taluks in North Malabar were excluded from the operation of this section and clause. There had been continuous and persistent agitation to remove this anomaly so that the benefit might accrue to all the agriculturists in the State. My Bill seeks to amend only that portion, that is, to delete that sub-clause which excludes certain taluks of North Malabar from the benefits of this section. I believe all the M.L.As. representing the areas affected by this legislation approve of this and have also submitted memoranda to the Government. Therefore, I am only surprised that even at this stage, instead of the Government trying to rectify the original wrong done to these people, oppose this Bill brought forward by a non-official Member. It does not involve any expenses on the exchequer and if the law of Procedure would have permitted, this could have been passed this very day. Therefore, I submit to the Government in all humility that if they feel any doubt, we are only at the stage of introduction of the Bill. The matter may be considered more deeply and if they still feel that public opinion is not in favour of the Amending Bill, they may oppose it. Therefore, I request that the Government may be pleased to withdraw their objection and allow the introduction of this Bill. It is not at all such a complicated Bill as the previous one. I request that the House may be pleased to accord permission to the introduction of my Bill."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :— Sir, I have to explain my position. The Bill brought forward by the hon. Member is to amend the Madras Agriculturists' Relief Act, 1938. The Act was primarily intended for affording relief to the agriculturists and it was subsequently modified by legislations in 1948 and 1950 with regard to usufructuary mortgages. This was effected by section 9-A. Certain areas in the State were sought to be exempted from the operation of this section. For example,

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

[27th July 1953]

South Kanara district and the taluks of Chirakkal Kottayam, Kurumbranad and Wynaad were excluded from the operation of this section. That was done with a purpose. The tenure there is peculiar. In South Kanara, usufructuary mortgage is called 'Arvar'. In the other taluks also, certain peculiarities are there. If the amendment sought to be made by the Bill of the hon. Member is accepted, the benefit will go to the landlord and not to the tenant, because the money is advanced by the tenant to the landlord. The hon. Member has till now been championing the cause of the ryots and agriculturists. I wonder why he has come forward with this Amending Bill, because it is against the interests of the ryots. That is why I am opposing it. I know the convention that a Bill is not opposed at the stage of introduction. But I want to point out to the hon. Member that he will be benefiting the landlord through his Bill."

11-40
a.m.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—" Sir"

MR. SPEAKER :—" No more discussion on this will be allowed."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" We are not opposing the introduction of this Bill as such. When the Bill comes up for discussion, we can consider other things."

MR. SPEAKER :—" If the motion is not opposed by the Government, it means that leave is given for the Bill to be introduced. The question is—

"That leave be granted for the introduction of the Madras Agriculturists' Relief (Amendment) Bill, 1953'."

The motion was put and carried.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—" Sir, I introduce the Bill."

B. Resolutions.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Now let us take up the Non-official Resolution standing in the name of Sri A. Ramachandra Reddiar."

SRI A. RAMACHANDRA REDDIAR :—" Sir, I move the resolution that stands"

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—" There is another Resolution that stands in the name of hon. Member Sri D. Krishnamurthy Gounder regarding the new scheme of Elementary Education. I request that that resolution may be advanced with the leave of the House. Under Rule 22 (3), I move—

'That item IV (3) on the Agenda, namely, the New Scheme of Elementary Education may be taken up before item IV (1), viz., Abolition of zonal system'."

27th July 1953]

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I already made a suggestion before many of the hon. Members came back to their seats that it would not be proper to take this up to-day. I did not expect the turn of events that took place to-day. Therefore I thought that it was better to take it on another day. I myself was not prepared for it. However, I may tell the hon. Members that immediately after the Government Bills are over, I am prepared to sit down for discussion. I hope hon. Members will leave it at that. There is no point gained by rushing it to-day.”

Sri Deivasigamany's motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ Sir, there is another resolution standing in the name of hon. Member Sri K. Venkaiah, i.e., Resolution No. 8. It is a very important resolution and I request that it may be advanced. This can be disposed of in two hours and I appeal to the Government to accept this resolution. Recently, Government have issued orders on this subject which has affected many poor people.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I appreciate the earnestness of Mr. Venkateswarlu. The subject-matter of the resolution relates to certain individual administrative acts. I think the resolution on food is far more important than the assignment of some banjar lands somewhere.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ I quite agree with the Hon. the Chief Minister that discussion on food is more important. I think for discussing the resolution on food, we will take a day or at least half a day. The resolution that I have referred to will take only 2 hours. If necessary, we can sit for one more hour and discuss this subject. As many of the poor agricultural labourers are being put to great trouble, it is better we take up this resolution for discussion even now.”

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—“ On the proposal made by hon. Member Sri Deivasigamany, the Hon. Chief Minister was pleased to state that we will have discussion on the new elementary education scheme. I want to know from the Hon. Chief Minister whether a day will be allotted for this purpose even in this sitting of the House. This resolution stands as a non-official resolution. I want to know from the Hon. Chief Minister whether there will be time to take up this non-official resolution and whether the Government themselves are prepared to bring in a motion on the subject and allot a day for its discussion.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ It was already promised that we will have discussion on this subject. The only question is when we will have that discussion. Whether it will take a whole day, or half a day, 4 hours or 2 hours is a

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [27th July 1953]

different matter altogether. But it will be taken up. Half-an-hour ago, when many of the hon. Members were not here, I thought it not proper to take up this subject to-day. I shall certainly give a day. But the only thing that I want is this. There are a few Government Bills which are technical in character. Immediately after those Bills are finished, this subject will be taken up. Therefore, there is no question of avoiding it."

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—" Sir, my point has not been answered. This is a non-official resolution. Necessary time may or may not be allotted for this. That is why I wanted to know whether the Government themselves will bring forward a motion on this subject and allot a day for its discussion. Can I have an answer to this point, Sir? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" How does the hon. Member expect the Government to bring a motion of this nature? The Hon. Chief Minister has already stated that a day will be allotted for the discussion of this subject."

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" Sir, there will be no difficulty in fixing a day. We are not keen that it should be taken up immediately. We want to know whether a full day will be allotted. Later on, it should not be said that there was not sufficient time and the discussion has to be restricted. Especially after the speech of the Hon. Chief Minister, we have a reasonable doubt that discussion may be restricted. If, however, the Hon. Chief Minister assures us that a full day will be allotted, then we can agree."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Suppose a day is allotted and the discussion is closed before the full time is over. What are we to do? It is only in that sense, the Hon. Chief Minister said that whatever time is necessary will be given. If it is not finished within a day, it may be taken up on another day."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The position is unnecessarily complicated by having some pre-conceived ideas. This is a resolution and it can be taken up at any time. The thing to be considered is this. What will be the business that will stand before the consideration of that resolution? As I said previously, there are a few non-controversial Government Bills. If we finish the consideration of those Bills, there will be no other business for us to consider. Then we can have discussion on that resolution for as long a time as we like."

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—" If the Hon. Chief Minister is prepared to give us an assurance that a particular day and hour will be fixed for discussion on the resolution, I shall withdraw my request. Otherwise, I am pressing it."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I am agreeable to any day the Hon. Speaker may fix for this purpose after to-morrow, as we expect the Government Bills to be over by to-morrow."

27th July 1953]

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ Sir, my suggestion to the Government, through you, is this. We may take up Resolution No. 8 that stands in the name of Mr. Venkaiah. It is a very important resolution. It is not a mere question of assignment of lands to political sufferers. We want that all banjar lands should be allotted to a particular class of people and it should be done quickly. At present, certain lands are being auctioned and we want to bring to the notice of the Government that such auctions are very much in disregard of the interests of the poor agricultural labourers. Therefore, I move—

‘ That under rule 22 (3) of the Madras Legislative Assembly Rules, Resolution No. 8, standing in the name of hon. Member, Sri K. Venkaiah, be taken up first. ’”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Motion moved—

‘ That under rule 22 (3) of the Madras Legislative Assembly Rules, Resolution No. 8, standing in the name of hon. Member, Sri K. Venkaiah, be taken up first. ’”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Mr. Nagi Reddi pointed out to me that we should have some discussion on the food situation. I thought that if we took up Resolution No. 1 which related to the zonal system, smuggling of paddy and rice, etc., we could incidentally consider the food situation also. Unfortunately, we have to allot some time for discussing the new elementary education scheme. I think a discussion on the food situation is more important, and we should give preference to it. Members of various constituencies will be able to express the difficulties experienced in their respective constituencies and we will be able to know the exact position in the State. I have also got information on paper. But I think the Government will be able to get some useful information from the hon. Members direct. For these reasons, I consider the food debate is more important. If, however, the hon. Members do not want a food debate, I have absolutely no objection to taking up the resolution that Mr. Nagi Reddi wants us to take. I would like to have a debate on the Resolution on the Abolition of the Zonal System so that we can discuss the food situation in general and it will be useful also to the public.”

11-50
a.m.

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ It is true that food should be discussed before we disperse. To-morrow all official business can be transacted and day after to-morrow probably we may have the new Education policy.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Food is very important. On the 30th we have the valedictory addresses.”

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ On the 31st we can have the valedictory addresses and on the 30th we will discuss food.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ 30th is the last date we have fixed.”

[27th July 1953]

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ We can have 31st as the last day of this session. I have also told the Leader of the House that this matter is as important as food and assignments are going on for quite a long time now. In our districts alone—Anantapur, Cuddapah and Guntur—there have been many cases. (The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam : ‘ We are not going to auction till the appointed day ’) I do not refer to auctions . . . ”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Why do you want to move the motion and charge us with partiality? Why not you allow the next Government to do the assignment and all the rest.”

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ The next Government will come only two months hence. After all postponement by a day is not at all very difficult. On the 30th, we can have a debate on food which is naturally very important and on the 31st we can have the valedictory addresses. There are people who have been cultivating for years . . . ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I want you to put that suggestion to the new Government. Why do you want us now to do it? ”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ The Hon. Chief Minister does not understand what exactly we want. That is the very reason why we want a debate on this matter.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I was trying to explain to Mr. Nagi Reddi that, if his anxiety was that land should not be put to auction, the Government was quite prepared to put it off and that if his anxiety, on the other hand, was to get an assignment without auction within the short period before us, I consider it embarrassing for this Government to do it. He may consider it. If he still wants, he can move his motion. A motion does not bring about an assignment.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ Under rule 22 of the Assembly Rules, Resolution No. 8 standing in the name of Sri K. Venkaiah be taken up first.’ ”

The motion was put and declared lost.

Mr. Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu demanded a poll and the division bell was rung.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ We agree to the motion being taken up now.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The Government have agreed and the motion may be moved by Mr. Venkaiah.”

27th July 1953]

ASSIGNMENT OF PORAMBOKES AND BANJAR LANDS.

* SRI K. VENKAIAH :—“ Sir, I move the following resolution :— 11-55 a.m.

‘ This Assembly recommends to the Government to take the following steps in relation to the assignment of the assessed and the unassessed porambokes and banjar lands in the State including the river, drain and tank porambokes as well as the forest banjars either under encroachments or lie unoccupied :—

(i) to cancel all the temporary assignments granted to political sufferers and to treat the local landless political sufferers in different areas on a par with the other local landless poor ;

(ii) to convert all the unassessed porambokes and banjar lands into assessed ones ;

(iii) to transfer, subdivide and assign the porambokes free of cost to the local landless poor up to an extent of 3 acres provided the total extent including the assigned land owned by the family is less than 5 acres ; and

(iv) to appoint special staff wherever necessary to complete the transfer, subdivision and assignment within the next financial year, i.e., within March 1954.’

“ అధ్యక్షా, నేను ఈ బిల్లును ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లును ప్రతిపాదించే సందర్భంలో కొన్ని ముఖ్య విషయాలను తమ దృష్టికి, తమ ద్వారా సభాపరిషత్తుకు తెలియజేయవలసిన అవసరం వున్నది.”

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—“ Sir, I was in the lobby when I heard the division bell and immediately I entered the Chamber to support the Government. Now I see there is not going to be a division. Every now and then, the Government oppose something and when a poll is demanded they support it. Have not the Government made up their mind and decided their policy with regard to the several resolutions? I cannot understand this.”

SRI K. VENKAIAH :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లును ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. ఈ సందర్భంలో కొన్ని ముఖ్య విషయాలను తమ దృష్టికి, తమ ద్వారా సభాపరిషత్తుకు తెలియజేయవలసిన అవసరం వున్నది. మొట్టమొదట రాజకీయ వాదనలకు భాములు ఇవ్వడం అనే సందర్భంలో గత జరలు ఎన్నికల అనంతరం ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు ఈ విషయంలో అనేక ప్రకటనలు చేసినందుడం ఈ సభాపరిషత్తుకు తెలియజేయవలసిన ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారు కూడా ప్రకటన చేసిన విషయం మీకు తెలుసు. అందులో రాజకీయ వాదనలకు భాములు మంజూరు ఇవ్వబడవచ్చు, అన్నీ రద్దు చేయబడుతాయి అని హామీ ఇచ్చారు. హామీ ఇవ్వడమే కాదు. 1949 వ సం॥లో వచ్చిన G.O. క్రింద ఇవ్వబడిన భాములు తాత్కాలికంగా రద్దు చేయడానికి ఉత్తరువులు జారీ

[Sri K. Venkaiah] [27th July 1953]

చేయడంకూడా జరిగింది. జూలై నెలలో ఈ ఉత్తరువులు ఇచ్చిన సందర్భంలో pending cases గురించి వివరణ ఇవ్వడం, దానిమీద చాలా తర్జనభర్జన వచ్చిన తరువాత ఫిబ్రవరి నెలలో G.O. No. 615 రు 1953 వ సం॥ ఫిబ్రవరి 28 వ తేదిన స్పష్టంచేయడం జరిగింది. సాగుకు అర్హులు ఇచ్చిన భూముల విషయంలో రాజకీయ వాధితులకు రద్దుచేయాలని, పట్టాలు ఇచ్చిన వాటివిషయంలోకూడా ఈ పట్టాలు ఎవరి కైతే ఇచ్చారో వారికి భూములు స్వాధీనంచేసే వాళ్ళవ్రత ప్రభుత్వం తీసుకోదు అని స్పష్ట చేయబడింది. అలాంటి పరిస్థితుల్లో మరల ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు కలుగుకోన్న మీదట—భిన్నమైన వైఖరి తీసుకొని 1949 వ సం॥లో ఏ భూములు రాజకీయవాధితులకు ఇవ్వడానికి నిర్ణయించేసారో, తాత్కాలికంగా మంజూరుచేసారో, వాటిన్నింటికీకూడా ఇప్పుడు పట్టాలు ఇవ్వాలని చెప్పి నిర్ణయించేసారు. ఇది చాలా ఆక్రమమైన విషయం. ఇది దాదాపు 50,000 ఎకరాలకు సంబంధించిన విషయం. ఇలాంటి ప్రధానమైన విషయాలమీద మంత్రిగారిని ప్రశ్నించినప్పుడు ఆ జి.ఓ. ఇచ్చారనేది సరియైనదికాదని ఆయన చెప్పడం, అసలు విషయాల మధ్య పరచడానికి ప్రయత్నించడమే అవుతుంది. నిజంగా ఇది కొన్ని వేల కుటుంబాలకు సంబంధించిన విషయం. కనీసం సభవారి దృష్టికి తీసుకురాకుండా అనేకసార్లు ప్రశ్నలు వేసినా సరియైన సమాధానం చెప్పకుండావుండే వ్యధి సరియైనదికాదు. కొన్ని వేల మీద కుటుంబాలకు సంబంధించిన ఈ విషయంమీద తానైన సభవారి అభిప్రాయం తీసుకోకుండా ఒక నిర్ణయం నిరంకుశంగా ప్రభుత్వంవారు తీసుకొని తీవ్రమైన నష్టానికి ప్రజలను గురిచేయడం సబబుకాదు. ఇదేరకంగా బంజరు భూముల విషయంలో వాటిని మీదలకు ఉచితంగా ఇవ్వాలి, విరకమైన డబ్బు దానికొంద వసూలుచేయకూడదు. ఈ విషయంలో రాష్ట్రమంతటా తీవ్రమైన ఆందోళన జరుగుచున్న సంగతి రాష్ట్రప్రభుత్వానికి తెలియనదికాదు. అనేకసార్లు ఈ ప్రశ్న రావడం బానికీ సుముఖమైన అలోచన జరుగుతోంది అని రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారు స్పష్టంచేయడంకూడా జరిగింది. కాని ఈ పరిస్థితుల్లో జూలైలోవచ్చిన G.O. లో పట్టణాల దగ్గరవున్న విలువైన భూములను వేలంవేసి అమ్ముతాము అనిచెప్పి, తరువాత క్రమంగా ఫిబ్రవరి వచ్చినపుడు విలువైన భూమిలు అన్నీకూడా మార్కెట్టు విలువ మొత్తం రెక్కదూడాలి. మార్కెట్టు విలువకు అమ్మాలి అని ప్రభుత్వం జి.ఓ. ప్రకటించిన సంగతి మీకు తెలియనటువంటిదికాదు. వేదలు ఏ విధమైన ఆధారం లేనటువంటివారు అంతాకూడా ఈ భూములమీద అనేకవిధాలుగా అప్పలుకూడాచేసి, ఎంతో డబ్బు ఖర్చుపెట్టారు. అటువంటి పరిస్థితుల్లో ఆ భూముల విషయంలో తిరిగి మార్కెట్టువాల్యూ గిట్టుకోవాలని అనడం చాలా ఆక్రమం. తిరిగి ఈ భూములన్నీ భూస్వాములకు దఖలైపోయే ప్రమాదంవున్నది. తిరిగి నేను మీదలకు అవకారం జరుగుతుందని, ఎన్నోవ్వనండియో సాగు చేసుకుంటున్న భూమినుండి వారు తొలగించబడడం అన్యాయం అని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. 1949 వ సం॥ ఫిబ్రవరి నెల G.O. లో ఈ సంబంధమైన క్లాజులు చేర్చడం జరిగింది. ఇది సక్రమంకాదని మంత్రిగారిని ఆడగడం, దానిమీద మంత్రిగారు విలువైన భూములువుంటే సాగుకు లాంఛికగా వుండే భూముల విషయంలో ఒకటే విలువ కట్టామని మంత్రిగారు ఈ కోరికమీద నుండి సమాధానం వెప్పారు. ఇది చాలా ఆక్రమమైన విషయం. ఇలాంటి బంజరు భూములు రాష్ట్రం మొత్తంమీద 60, 70 లక్షల ఎకరాలదాకా వున్నాయి. ఈ భూములను వేదలకు ఇచ్చే సందర్భంలో తిరిగి మార్కెట్టు వాల్యూ కట్టాలనడం ఈ భూములను తిరిగి రాజకీయ వాధితులని వేరు వెప్పి భూస్వాములకు ఇవ్వడమే లక్ష్యంగా కనిపిస్తుంది. ఇది భూస్వాములను బలపరచడం తప్ప వేరుకాదని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తమద్వారా విన్నవిస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయంలో ప్రభుత్వంవారు తమ విధానాన్ని పూర్తిగా మార్చు

12
noon.

27th July 1953] [Sri K. Venkaiah]

కోవాలని, బీదలకు అన్యాయం చేసి భూస్వాములను బలపరచే పద్ధతి మారాలని తిరిగి కోరుచున్నాను. ఇదేరకంగా లంక భూముల విషయంలో జరిగిన సంగతులకూడా మీకు తెలుసు. ఇక్కడ ఈ విషయంలో adjournment ప్రతిపాదనలుకూడా వచ్చాయి. ఆ విషయంకూడా మీకు తెలుసు. ఈ సందర్భంలో శ్రీమాన్ రాజగోపాలాచార్యులుగారు కూడా భూస్వామ్య రద్దు విధానాన్ని ప్రభుత్వంతోపాటు వ్యతిరేకించే స్పృహస్థులైన కమిటీకూడా బంజరు భూములను వేదలకు పంపడం విషయంలో పరిశీలించింది. అంతేకాకుండా లంక భూములను వేలం వేసే పద్ధతి ఉండరాదని చప్పి అందులో స్పష్టం చేయడం జరిగింది. ఇలాంటి పరిస్థితుల్లో ప్రభుత్వంవారు భూములన్నింటినీకూడా మళ్ళీ వేలానికి తీసుకురావడం అంటే, డబ్బు పున్నటువంటి వాళ్ళే వాడి, బీదలు స్థిరంగా వ్యవసాయ కూలీలుగానే ఉండిపోతే తి కలిగించడం తప్ప ఇంకొకటి కాదని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. నేను ప్రధానంగా ఇప్పుడుకోరేది విమిటంపై ప్రభుత్వంవారు 1953 వ సం॥ మే 29 వ తేది గల, G.O. No. 1708 లో క్రింది రాజకీయ బాధితులకు ఇచ్చిన భూములను స్థిరపరచడం అక్రమం. ఈ G.O. ను ఉపసంహరించుకోకపోతే చాలా అన్యాయం జరుగుతుంది. అనేక వేల కుటుంబాలు నాశనమైపోతాయి. వేలాలలో తిరిగి బీదలు పాడుకోడం వల్ల న్యాయం జరగదని 1953 వ సం॥ ఫిబ్రవరి 28 వ తేదిగల G.O. No. 615 లోని ఈ సందర్భమైన భాగాలను తొలగించాలని చెప్పి నేను ప్రభుత్వాన్ని కోరు చున్నాను.

“బంజరు భూములను పట్టాకిచ్చే విషయంలో ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఇచ్చిన కొత్త ఉత్తరువులవల్ల వేద రైతులకు ఎంతో అన్యాయం జరిగే ప్రమాదం ఉన్నది. ఈ భూములను మార్కెటు ధరలకుగాని, లేక వేలంపాటులోగాని విక్రయించవలసిన ప్రభుత్వంవారి ఉద్దేశమైనట్లయితే దానివల్ల ఎంతో కాలంగా భూములను వాగుచేసి, సాగులోనికి తెచ్చినవారికి చాలా నష్టం వాటిల్లుతుంది. అధికాహారోత్పత్తి ప్రణాళికల క్రింద ఈ బంజరు భూములను అనేకమంది వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు, హరిజనులు, వేద రైతులు ఎంతో శ్రేరీక కష్టానికోర్చి సాగుకు లావాతైన వాటిగా చేశారు. గత 20, 15 సంవత్సరాలుగా కొందరు ఈ భూములను సాగుచేసుకుంటున్న సందర్భాలు కూడా ఎన్నో ఉన్నాయి. అటువంటి పరిస్థితులను ఈ భూములను వేలానికి పెడతా మని, ఎవ్వరు ఎక్కువకు పొడినట్లయితే వాళ్ళకే పట్టా లిస్తామనడం చాలా అన్యాయం. ఇంతకాలంగా వేద రైతాంగం పడిన శ్రమ అంతా వృథా అవుతుంది. ఈ విధంగా రైతులు, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు ఎంతో కాలంగా సాగుచేసుకుంటున్న భూములు, రొంపేరు ప్రాంతంలో 18 వేల ఎకరాలు, డివి సీమలో 12 వేల ఎకరాలు, ఇదే విధంగా ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలో ఎన్నో వేల ఎకరాలు ఉన్నది. ఈ భూమి అంతా ఇంత కాలంగా ఎవరైతే వాటిని సాగుచేసుకుంటున్నారో వారికే పట్టాలివ్వడం న్యాయమని ప్రభుత్వానికి విన్నవిస్తున్నాను. ఇంతకాలంగా ఈ భూములను unassessed భూములుగా ఉంచారు. ఇకముందు రైత్యారీ రేట్లను ఈ భూములపై విధించి, వాటిని assessed భూములుగా మార్చి వేద రైతాంగానికి ఉచితంగా ఇవ్వడం ఈ ప్రభుత్వం వారి ధర్మం. 1954 వ సం॥ మార్చి లోపల ఈ పని పూర్తి చేయవలసినదని కోరు తున్నాను. ఈ భూములను ఇచ్చే విషయంలో రాజకీయాల ప్రసక్తి లేకుండా ఇంత కాలంగా వాటిని ఎన్నో కష్టతిష్టలకోర్చి సాగులోనికి తీసుకొచ్చినవారికి ఇవ్వాలని కోరుతూ ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను.”

[Sri V. Sri Krishna]

[27th July 1953]

12-10
p.m.

“ Sir, Resolution 28 stands in my name. It has the same content as the resolution moved by my hon. Friend Sri Venkaiah. So, I rise to support the resolution moved by the Hon. Sri Venkaiah. While doing so, I wish to invite the attention of the Hon. Minister to certain facts. Even according to official figures published in the Directory of Madras, it was stated that something like 90 lakhs of acres are lying as cultivable waste in our Province. According to the answer given recently by the Hon. Minister on the floor of this House, it was said that 69 lakhs of acres lie as cultivable waste. In addition to this an area of 90 lakhs or one crore of acres was said to be taken up for cultivation but left uncultivated for lack of proper facilities. There are some more lands which come under the category of forest banjars. So altogether there are 2 or $2\frac{1}{2}$ crores of acres which can be brought under cultivation provided facilities are given and the lands are assigned to the actual tillers of the soil. But Government have taken steps otherwise discouraging the actual tillers and encouraging those who do not till the land themselves. Even in the times of the British rule there were Sivayijama occupants cultivating banjar lands; but later on when the Congress came to power in G.O. No. 1523, Revenue, dated 11th June 1949. Priority in assignment was given to political sufferers and lands were assigned to those, who happened to be non-cultivators and who had no agricultural bias at all and who had properties amounting to 50 or even 100 acres or so. After that Government Order was passed, naturally the lands were again left without cultivation. Further, the actual tillers of sivayijamas were evicted from the lands and the lands which were previously under cultivation even during British rule were simply allowed to lie waste after the Congress came to power, especially in our district in Romperu area. When these anomalies arose, we approached the Government and brought to their notice that the non-cultivators to whom lands were assigned had left the lands lying waste and so requested the Government to revise their policy and assign the lands to the original cultivators, the landless poor in the neighbourhood. Government were pleased due to the pressure of popular opinion, to change their old policy and give priority once again to the landless poor. The landless poor cultivators got encouraged; they again tilled the land and brought it under cultivation, they raised crops in the land and thereby there was rise in the food production also. But recently, due to certain pressure from the Congress circles, especially after the statements made by Sri Kamaraj Nadar on the Tamil side and Sri Kaleswara Rao on the Andhra side, the Government yielded, changed the revised policy and went back to the same old policy of their predecessors and distributed the lands to political sufferers, even though they had their own patta lands. Not only that, Government have issued orders recently and sent instructions to the local officials that lands even under occupation of Sivoyijamdars which had been under their occupation, cultivation and enjoyment for the last 20 or even 50 years should be put to public auction or sold at the market value. This order is again affecting the actual cultivators, the poorer sections of the Sivoyijamdars and the land will again go into the hands of the people who have their own lands and who can afford to pay the cost of the

27th July 1953] [Sri V. Sri Krishna]

land. This changed policy of the Government, this reluctance to assign the lands to the landless poor who actually cultivate the land and this partiality to the landlords who do not cultivate the land but who can pay the cost, this policy of the Government is adversely affecting cultivation of the wastes and at the same time the growth of food crops and the increase in food production. Hence we have brought this motion before the House. The clauses mentioned in the motion are really too general and they can be supported by all sections of the House to whatever political party they belong. We have requested the Government to take immediate steps to see that these things are done without delay. The first clause says :

‘ This Assembly recommends to the Government to take the following steps in relation to the assignment of the assessed and the unassessed porambokes and banjar lands in the State including the river, drain and tank porambokes as well as forest banjars either under encroachments or lie unoccupied.’

In the first case we ask the Government to ‘cancel all the temporary assignments granted to political sufferers and to treat the local landless political sufferers in different areas on a par with the other local landless poor’. Those who deserve to be given lands even among political sufferers should be treated on a par with the local landless poor. We are not barring them from getting lands, but at the same time we want Government to see that those who have got lands previously are not classed in the category of political sufferers eligible for lands. We have no objection to the landless poor political sufferers getting lands. The other thing we want the Government to do is, ‘to convert all the unassessed porambokes and banjar lands into assessed ones.’ There are very many areas in our district as well as in other districts of our Province which are not yet assessed but which lie unassessed. We only ask the Government to convert these into assessed lands and assign them to local landless poor cultivators. By section (iii) we request Government ‘to transfer, subdivide and assign the porambokes free of cost to the local landless poor up to an extent of 3 acres provided the total extent including the assigned land owned by the family is less than 5 acres’. Lastly we request Government to ‘appoint special staff wherever necessary and to complete the transfer, subdivision and assignment within the next financial year, i.e., within March 1954.’

“ Sir, these are the provisions we want the Government to introduce in this Bill. Lands were under occupation of the sivayijamadars for the last 50 or even 55 years. In Romperu area, in a village called Kankatapalem there was one ryot cultivating the land from the year 1900; that means some 53 years back he entered the land. He spent much of his money, sold away his utensils and other properties he had and brought the land under cultivation. Irrigation facilities were given to that land now and he was able to cultivate and get returns only last year. After spending so much of money and labour, some two or three years back the land was assigned to political sufferers and he was prevented from entering the land. Later due representations were made to the Government while refusing to yield possession

[Sri V. Sri Krishna]

[27th July 1953]

to the new assignee. But now according to the orders issued recently, that land is going to be sold out at the market value or auctioned. So, after cultivating the land for over 53 years and after spending so much of money the land is to be offered for sale, despite the land being under cultivation and enjoyment of that person for over the last half a century. That is why we request Government to see that this clause is also introduced and that lands under the occupation of the sivayijamadars be assigned to the local landless poor free of cost. The Government also have got a responsibility to provide them with financial facilities as also irrigation facilities, so that the lands may be brought under cultivation immediately and supplement the food production. I also request Government to redraft their orders on the basis of this resolution and see that the banjar lands are assigned to the landless poor and provide them with credit, irrigation and other facilities so that the 2 crores and odd acres of waste lands in our Province be brought under cultivation to improve food production and relieve unemployment. I request all hon. Members of the House to support this motion without any political bias."

12-20
p.m.**SRI B. LAKSHMINARASA RAJU :—**"అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బంజరు భూముల

సమస్య కొంతమంది పేద పలకు చాలా చిక్కులను కలుగజేస్తున్నదని చెప్పక తప్పదు. ఈ మధ్య రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారు మా నరసాపురం తాలూకాలో పర్యటించిన సందర్భం లో ఈ విషయమై వారితో సాకుల్యంగా చర్చించవలసిన మేము సంకల్పించుకొనినప్పటికీ తగినంతవ్యధి లేకపోయినందువల్ల మేము రాండంలను మాత్రమే ఇవ్వగలిగాము. మా నరసాపురం తాలూకాలో దాదాపు 10 వేల ఎకరముల బంజరుభూమి కత 10, 15 సంవత్సరములుగా పేదరైతులచేత సాగు చేసుకొనబడుచున్నది. అధికాహారోత్పత్తి కార్యక్రమంకింద వారికి భూములు ఇదివరలో సాగుచేసుకొనుటకు ఇవ్వబడినవి. ఎంతో వ్యయప్రయాసకోర్చి బీదరైతులు ఈ భూములను ఇప్పటికి ఫలంనున్నానికి తీసు కొనివచ్చారు. ఈ పరిస్థితులలో ఆ భూములను రాజ్ కీయ పాధితులకు ఇస్తామని, వేలం లో ఎక్కువ పాటి పొడినవారికిస్తామని ప్రభుత్వంవారు అనడంవల్ల ఇంతకాలంగా శ్రమ పడినవాడికి చాలా అన్యాయం చేయడమవుతుందని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి మనవి చేస్తున్నాము. ఈ విషయమై ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఈ మధ్య పాస్ చేసిన ఉత్తర్వువల్ల పేద వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు చాలా ఆందోళన చెబుతున్నారు. ఇంతకాలంగా తాము సాగు చేసుకొంటు న్న భూములను స్థానికంగా ఉండి భూస్వాములు వేలంలో ఎక్కువ డబ్బును పొడి న్యాధీ నం చేసుకుంటారనికూడా వారు భయపడుతున్నారు. బంజరుగా ఉన్న భూములను ఎంతో శ్రమపడి ఫలంనున్నానికి తెచ్చినవారికికాక ఇతరులకు వాటిని ఈ సమయంలో ఇవ్వదలచడం చాలా విచారకరమైనటువంటి విషయం. ఈ ఉత్తరువులను ప్రభుత్వం వారు సవరించి ఎవ్వరైతే ఇవ్వబడు వాటిని సాగుచేసుకుంటున్నారో వారికి ఆ భూము లను పట్టాలుగా ఇవ్వవలసిన శ్రీ కొల్లా వెంకయ్యగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన తీర్మానాన్ని బల పరుస్తూ నేను విరమిస్తున్నాను."

*** SRI M. VEERABHADRAM :—**"అధ్యక్ష, శ్రీ కొల్లా వెంకయ్యగారు తీసుకొనివచ్చిన ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. బంజరు భూములను పట్టాలిచ్చే సందర్భంలో ప్రభుత్వంవారు అవలంబిస్తున్న విధానంవల్ల పేద వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు ముఖ్యంగా హరిజనులకు చాలా అన్యాయం జరుగుతున్నదని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తెలియ జేస్తున్నాను. ఈనాడు వేలంలో ఎవ్వరు ఎక్కువ మొత్తానికి పొడగలుగుతారో

27th July 1953] [Sri M. Veerabhadram]

వారికి ఈ భూములు దఖలుపడే ప్రమాదం ఉంది. గ్రామాలలో ఉండే పెద్ద పెద్ద భాగ్య వంతులతోను, భూస్వాములతోను హరిజనులు సమానముగా వేలం పాడలేని కారణంచేత ఎంతో కష్టపడి ఈనాటికి సాగులోనికి తెచ్చిన భూములు భూస్వాముల స్వాధీనపడే విధానాన్ని ఈ ప్రభుత్వం అవలంబించడం చాలా విచారకరమైన విషయం. ఈ విధానం భూస్వాములకు సహాయపడేదిగాను పేద వ్యవసాయదారులకు నష్టదాయకంగాను పరిణమించింది. అనకాపల్లి తాలూకాలో పెదముప్పిడివాడలో 48 హరిజనులు సాగుచేసుకొనుచున్న టువంటి 25 ఎకరాల భూమిని స్వాధీనంచేసుకొని, ఆ హరిజనులకు ఆ భూమి లేకుండా, ఒక రోజును తీసుకొనివచ్చి, ఆయనను రాజకీయవాదితుడని చెప్పి ఆయనకు ఆ భూముల పట్టా ఇవ్వడం కోసం ప్రయత్నం జరిగింది. ప్రభుత్వము ఆతనికి పట్టా ఇవ్వడానికి సిద్ధంగా ఉన్నది. అంతేకాకుండా, ఆయనకు పట్టా లేకుండానే మూడు నూతులకు well subsidy scheme క్రింద 15 వందల రూపాయలు ప్రభుత్వం మంజూరు చేసింది. దీనివల్ల ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క పక్షపాతం వివిధంగా ఉండో స్పష్టమవుతుంది. ఐదు సంవత్సరాలుగా హరిజనులు సాగుచేసుకొనుచున్న టువంటి 25 ఎకరాల భూమికి వారికి ఈ రోజు వరకు పట్టాలు ఇవ్వలేదు. గత సంవత్సరం మార్చి నెలనంచి ఇప్పటివరకుకూడా ఈ విషయమై రిజిస్ట్రార్ మంత్రికి అనేక వార్తలు పిటిషన్లు పెట్టుకొని చెప్పకోవడం జరుగుతున్నది. ప్రభుత్వం ఈ విషయంలో విదేశీ ఆర్థిక సౌకర్యం చేస్తున్నారనిగాని ఆదేమిటో తెలియదు. ఏమైపప్పటికీ ఆ బంజరు భూములను ఇప్పటివరకు హరిజనులకు ఇవ్వడం జరుగలేదు. అక్కడ ఉన్న టువంటి ధన వసతులు, భూస్వాములు ఈ హరిజనులపైన 144 వ నెక్లసని, 145 వ నెక్లసని పెట్టి పాలీసు కోర్టులకు, సీవిల్ కోర్టులకు వారిని తీసుకువచ్చి అనేక రకాలుగా ఇబ్బందులు పెట్టడం జరుగుతున్నది. దీనికంతకు ప్రభుత్వమే బాధ్యత వహించవలసి యున్నదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. మరొక విషయం మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. బోనగి గ్రామంలో ఒక రైతు అయిదు సంవత్సరాలుగా 5 ఎకరాలు భూమిని దున్నుకొనుచుండగా, ఆ భూమిని ఆ రైతుకు ఇచ్చుటకు బదులు, ఎక్కడో 10 మైళ్ల దూరంలో ఉన్న టువంటి ఒక ధనవంతునికి Agriculture B Form నమోదుచేయడం జరిగింది. ఈలాంటి సందర్భాలు అనేకమైన టువంటివి గ్రామాలన్నింటిలోను జరుగుతున్నాయి. ముఖ్యంగా బీదవాళ్లకు ఈలాంటి అన్యాయం జరుగుతున్నది. కాట్టి ప్రభుత్వం తనయొక్క పాలీసీని కూర్చుకొని భూములకు వేలం వేసే పద్ధతిగాని, డబ్బుకు ఆస్తుడం అనే పద్ధతిగాని మాను ని ఎవరైతే భూమి లేకుండా ఉంటారో, వారు హరిజనులైనారే, ఇతర బీద ప్రజలైనారే అటువంటి వారికి ఈ బంజరు భూములు, పొరంబోకులు వగైరా భూములకు పట్టాలు ఇచ్చేటట్లుగా చేయవలసిందని ప్రభుత్వానికి మనవిచేస్తూ ఇంటిలో వినిపిస్తున్నాను."

* SRI G. JOSEPH :—“ అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బంజరు భూముల సమస్య అనేది ఈ రోజు వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు చాలా తీవ్రమైన టువంటి సమస్య. ప్రభుత్వం ఈ నాడు ఈ బంజరు భూములను వేలం పెట్టడం దానివల్ల వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు చాలా నిరాశ, నిస్వేదన కలుగజేస్తున్నది. బీద వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు, హరిజనులు అనేక కష్టనష్టాలకు పీడ్చి, బిటివ్ హయాంలో నుంచీ, యుద్ధకాలంలో నుంచీ గూడా సాగుచేస్తూ వచ్చారు. ఎక్కో వ్యయ ప్రయాసలకు గురిఅయి, ఈ బీద వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు బంజరు భూములను సాగులోకి తీసుకొనివచ్చినందుననే యీ భూములు ఖరీదుగల వయినాయి. ఈ విషయాన్ని మరిచిపోయి, ప్రభుత్వం అవి ఖరీదుగల భూములని చెప్పి వాటిని వేలం పెట్టుటకు తయారైంది. ఈ బంజరు భూములు మొట్టమొదట గియ్యబ్లి భూములక్రింద ఉండిన టువంటివాటిని, ఈ నాడు ఖరీదుగల భూములని చెప్ప

12-28 p.m.

[Sri G. Joseph]

[27th July 1953]

దానికి కారణమేమిటో ఆలోచించుకొమ్మని కోరుతున్నాను. వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు అధికంగాను, కారీరకంగాను ఎంతో కష్టపడి బంజరుగా ఉన్న టువంటి భూములను ఈ విధంగా సాగులాకి తీసుకరావడమే దీనికి ప్రధాన కారణమని అంగీకరించక తప్పదు. దీనిని ప్రభుత్వం ముఖ్యంగా గుర్తించకలసియున్నది. ఆ విధంగా వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు వృద్ధికి తెచ్చిన టువంటి భూములకు ఈ నాడు ప్రభుత్వం విలువకట్టి వేలంవేయమనడం, కాకులను గొట్టి, గడ్డలకు వేసేటటువంటి విధానంగా ఉన్నది. ఈ విధానంవల్ల ఈ నాడు, చాలాకాలము నుండి కష్టపడి వృద్ధికి తెచ్చిన టువంటి మీద ప్రజానీకానికి ఆ భూములు దక్కకుండా పోయేటటువంటి పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడుతున్నాయి, కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వం ఈ విధానాన్ని మార్చుకొని ఏ వేద ప్రజానీకమైతే యీ భూములను సాగు చేస్తున్నారో వారికే అవి ఇచ్చేటట్లు చేయవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను. వందలకొలది, వేలకొలది ఎకరాలు ఉన్న టువంటి ఈ భూములను భూస్వామి వర్గానికి కట్టిబెట్టేటటువంటి విధానాన్ని మార్చుకొని వేద ప్రజానీకానికి అండగా ప్రభుత్వం ఉండాలని నేను కోరుతున్నాను. అంతే కాకుండా, ఈ బంజరు భూములు, సోనెటిక్రింద ఉండేటటువంటి లంకా భూములను కూడా ప్రభుత్వం వేలం పెట్టాలని ఒక నిర్ణయానికి వచ్చినట్లు తెలుస్తున్నది. గుంటూరు జిల్లా కలెక్టరు ఈ సోనెటి భూములను వేలము పెడతాము. మీకైతే మార్కెట్టు రేటుకు లేక 80% ధరకు ఇస్తామని ఈ సోనెటి వాళ్లకు చెప్పుతున్నట్లు తెలుస్తున్నది. కోల్లూరు, ఈపూరు, ఈపూరులంక సోనెటిల తరఫున ఈ వేలం విషయమై మంత్రివర్గం దగ్గరకు రాయచోరుం రావడం జరిగింది. మంత్రిగారు ఆలోచిస్తామని సమాధానం చెప్పారు. అది చాలా తీవ్రమైన టువంటి సమస్య. సుమారు పదిహేను వందలమంది జనాభా, రెండు వందల ఎకరాలుగల ఈ సోనెటి భూములు గురించి, వీటిపైన అనేక కారణాలు కట్టి, వీళ్లు ఈ భూములను స్వయముగా సాగుచేయడం లేదని, వీటిని అమ్ముకొంటున్నారని, సబ్ లీమిటు ఇస్తున్నారనే కారణాలు చెప్పి అక్కడ ఉంటున్న caste Hindus ఈ భూములను కాజేయాలనే దురుద్దేశముతో ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నారు. కనుక అటువంటి పిటిషన్లను, కారణాలను ఆధారంగా తీసుకొని ఆ విధంగా అనుసరించడం అనేది చాలా అన్యాయమని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ మీద ప్రజానీకం సాగుచేస్తున్న టువంటి ఈ సోనెటిల క్రింద ఉన్న టువంటి భూములను, ఇతరులకు అట్టిపెట్టడమనేది సరియైన టువంటి విధానం కాదని నేను ధారా గోపాలశాస్త్రివంటి వ్యక్తులకు వందలకొలది ఎకరాలు, వందల సంవత్సరాలు కాలకు యివ్వడం న్యాయంకాదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ tenants కో ఆఫరేటివ్ సోనెటిలు 20, 30, సంవత్సరాలుగా ఉంటున్నవి. ఇంగ్లీషు ప్రభుత్వంలో register అయిన టువంటి ఈ సోనెటిలపట్ల, హరిజనులకు అండగా ఉన్నదని చెప్పుకొంటున్న టువంటి ప్రభుత్వం ఈ నాడు అనుసరిస్తున్న టువంటి విధానం విమోచన సరియైనది కాదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. కనుక ఈ సోనెటిల క్రింద ఉన్న టువంటి భూములను సాగు చేస్తున్న టువంటివారికే భూములపట్టాలు ఇవ్వడం న్యాయంగా ఉంటుందని, ఆ విధంగా చేయవలసిందని ప్రభుత్వానికి విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తూ వేంకయ్యగారు తీసుకవచ్చిన టువంటి ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, the principle of making gifts of land to political sufferers who have laid down their lives and lost all their property for the sake of freedom, is undoubtedly based on justice and fairplay. But the point, also referred to by several hon. Members, is that in the allotment of land to political sufferers, poor people who were in occupation were evicted. It must be certainly possible for the Government to see that those lands which were previously in the occupation

27th July 1953] [Sri K. V. Ramesam]

of poor Harijans and other landless people are given back. But we must also bear in mind the general principle that is adopted by the Government in the allotment of lands to political sufferers, viz., that those political sufferers who have laid down their lives or lost everything for the sake of freedom should not go abegging. If they are found to have no property at all to fall back upon, it is, I think, the bounden duty of every citizen and every Government to see that they are rewarded for the services which they have so gloriously rendered to the country. Therefore I feel that it is absolutely necessary that a review of all grants of land to political sufferers should be made. If in the course of such review it is found that those political sufferers have, either unlawfully or by their influence, got valuable lands, they should not be allowed to enjoy them and the lands should be taken back by the Government. But those people who have no property other than these grants and who have really lost everything for the sake of freedom struggle, must be allowed to retain the lands. Lands which are in occupation by the poor landless should not be taken away for the purpose of allotting them to political sufferers. Then the question is as to preference. In my opinion, all the genuine political sufferers must be permitted to retain lands which are already not in occupation and then all the waste lands must be allotted to the landless people without putting them to auction as otherwise there will be no opportunity on their part to till and increase the food production. Therefore, Sir, I suggest that a thorough review of all cases should be immediately ordered and justice done to every party."

SRI A. RATHINAM :—“ கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கனம் வெங்கடாச்சாரி அவர்கள் பிரேரித்திருக்கும் தீர்மானத்தை நான் ஆதரிக்கிறேன். அதற்காக மிக மிக சந்தோஷமும் அடைகிறேன். இந்த நாட்டிலே நிலம் இல்லாத பல பேர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அதவும் ஒரு பெரும் சமுதாயத்தைச் சேர்ந்த மக்கள், மொத்த ஜனத்தொகையில் மூன்றில் ஒரு பங்கு தாழ்த்தப்பட்டவர்களாக இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் இன்றையதினம் நிலச் சுவாந்தாரர்களிடம் அடிமைகளாக உழைத்து உழைத்து உயிர் வாழும் நிலக் கூலிகளாக இருக்கிறார்கள். சர்க்கார் ஏதோ ஹரிஜன முன்னேற்றத்தில் அக்கறை காட்டி வருவதாகச் சொல்லிக்கொண்டு ஹரிஜன மாணவர்களுக்கு சோப்பும், சீப்பும் வழங்கிவிட்டால் மாத்திரம் அவர்கள் முன்னேற்றம் அடைந்து விடுவார்கள் என்று எண்ணிவிடக்கூடாது. அவர்களுக்கு நிறையக் கல்விச் சலுகை அளிக்கவேண்டும். இருநூறு, மூன்றூறு என்று சம்பளம் வாங்கும் அரசாங்க அதிகாரிகளின் பிள்ளைக்கு ஏதோ சலுகை அளிப்பதாகச் சொல்லுகிறார்களே தவிர உண்மையில் மிகவும் பிற்போக்கான நிலைமையில் வாழ்கின்ற தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்களுக்கு எந்தவிதமான சலுகையும் அளிப்பதாகத் தெரியவில்லை. நூறு ரூபாய்க்கு மிகவும் குறைவான சம்பளம் வாங்கக் கூடிய ஹரிஜன மக்களின் குழந்தைகளுக்கும் இன்றையதினம் சம்பளம் கட்டி படிக்கவேண்டிய அவல நிலைமைதான் நாட்டில் இருக்கிறது. இன்றைய தினம் நிலம் இல்லாத காரணத்தினால்தான் அவர்கள் பெரும்பாலும் நிலச்சுவாந்தாரர்களுக்கு அடிமைகளாக வாழவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. தலைக்கு ஒரு ஏக்கர நிலம் இருந்தால் கூட அவர்கள் கஷ்டப்பட்டு நிலத்தில் உழைப்பது தோடுகூட, தங்களுக்கு வேண்டிய உணவையும், பிறமக்கள் உயிர் வாழ்வதற்கு வேண்டிய உணவையும் நிறைய உற்பத்தி செய்து கொடுப்பார்கள் என்பதில் சிறிதும் சந்தேகமேயில்லை. நகரப் பகுதிகளுக்கு வேண்டிய மிகவும் அதிகமான உணவு அவர்களே உற்பத்தி செய்து கொடுப்பார்கள். இந்த நாட்டிலே ஒரு சில ஜமீந்தார்கள் இருக்கலாம், பணக்காரர்கள் இருக்கலாம். அந்த சில ஜமீந்தாரர்களும், கோயில் நிலக்காரர்களும், மடாதி

12-33
p.m.

[Sri A. Rathinam]

[27th July 1953]

பதிகளும் மக்களை ரொம்பவும் கஷ்டப்படுத்துகிறார்கள். புறம்போக்கு நிலங்களில் உழுது பயிரிட்டு வந்த தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்கள் தற்போலத்தில் அரசாங்கத்தாரால் வெளியேற்றப்பட்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த நிலங்கள் இன்றைய தினம் அரசியல் தியாகிகள் என்ற பெயரில் பல பெரிய பணக்காரர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. ஆனால் அவைகள் எல்லாம் உழுது பயிரிடப்படாமல் கிடக்கின்றன. அதன் காரணமாகத்தான் நாம் இன்றையதினம் வட நாட்டையும், வெளிநாட்டையும், நம் நாட்டின் உணவுத் தேவையை பூர்த்தி செய்ய எதிர்பார்த்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறோம். ஒரு சில ஜமீந்தார்கள் பல மக்களை விவசாயக் கூலிகளாக நடத்திக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். விவசாயக் கூலிகள் சாப்பாட்டுக்கு ரொம்பவும் தவித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த நிலைமையை அரசாங்கம் வளர விடக்கூடாது. அரசாங்கத்திற்கு வரிப்பணம் கட்டும் பல பொதுமக்களை, அரசாங்கம் ஒரு சில மிராசதார்களின் நலனைக் காப்பாற்றுவதற்காக, அந்த பொதுமக்களை பணத்தைக்கொண்டே போலீஸ் படையை நிருவி அவர்களுக்கு விரோதமாக எவ்விதவது ரொம்பவும் தப்பாடும் மக்கள் பிடுங்கி வருவதற்கும் வரிப்பணம் மக்களின் நன்மைக்காகவே உபயோகப்படுத்தப் படவேண்டும். ஆனால் இன்றையதினம் மக்களின் நலனை நசுக்க கோடிக்கணக்கான ரூபாய்கள் செலவழிக்கப்படுகிறது. ஆனால் சில லட்சம் ரூபாய்களை மக்களின் நன்மையை உத்தேசித்து செலவிடப்படவேண்டுமென்று சொன்னால் அரசாங்கம் அதற்குப் பணம் இல்லையென்று சொல்லி வருகிறது.

12-40
p.m.

“ஸ்ரீ வெங்கையா அவர்களின் தீர்மானப்படி தரிசாகக் கிடக்கும் நிலங்களை ஆளுக்கு 3 ஏக்கராக நிலமற்ற ஏழைகளுக்கு வழங்க வேண்டுமென்று கோரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இது ரொம்பவும் நியாயமாகும். நின்ற தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட ஏழை மக்கள் சமுதாயத்தில் சமத்துவத்தைப் பெற இது மிகவும் உதவி செய்யும். மேலும் அவர்கள் மிசவும் கஷ்டப்பட்டு தங்களுக்கு வேண்டிய உணவுப் பொருளை உற்பத்தி செய்து கொண்டுவந்தோகூட, நகரப் பற்றங்கலி உள்ள மக்களின் தேவையையும் ஈடுசெய்யக்கூடிய அளவு மிகவும் அதிகமாக உணவை உற்பத்தி செய்வார்கள். அவர்கள் குடும்பங்களும் பசிபட்டினி இன்றி சுகமாக வாழமுடியும். நானும் நகரம் சுயீசுமாக வாழ முடியும். நம் நாடு பிறநாட்டை உணவுக்கு எதிர்பார்த்திருக்க வேண்டிய அவசியமும் கிடையாது. நாம் மற்ற பகுதிகளுக்கு உணவை அனுப்பக்கூடிய அளவிற்கு உணவு நிலைமை நம் நாட்டில் சீர்பட்டு விடும். பர்மாவையோ, மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தையோ நாம் உணவுக்கு நம்பி வாழும் அவலங்கெட்ட நிலையும் போய்விடும். ஆகவே தரிச நிலங்களை தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட ஏழை மக்களுக்கு 3 ஏக்கரா வீதம் தீர்மானத்தில் கண்டபடி கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். கள்ள மார்க்கெட்டை ஒழிக்கக் கூடிய அளவில் உணவு தானியத்தை உற்பத்திசெய்து பஞ்சப் பிரதேசங்களுக்கு எல்லாம் அம்மக்கள் அனுப்பிவைப்பார்கள். தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்களை உயர்த்துவதற்கு நிலங்கள் கொடுத்தாலே போதும். அவர்கள் உழுது பயிரிட்டு சமுதாயத்தில் சமநிலையை எய்துவார்கள். தீண்டாமை விலக்குச்சட்டம் அப்பொழுது அமலில் இருக்கவேண்டிய அவசியமேயில்லை. ஹரிஜனங்களுக்கு தனிச்சுலுகை கொடுப்பதாக சர்க்காரும் யாரையும் மொற்ற வேண்டிய அவசியமும் இருக்காது. மனிதன் மனிதனாக சுயமரியாதையோடு வாழ்வார்கள். இன்றையதினம் இல்லாமைமையின் கொடுமைதான் அடிமையாக நடக்கும்படி பணிய வைக்கிறது. “ஐயா சாமி, ஒரு கலம் நெல் கொடு. நான் என்ன வேண வேலை செய்கிறேன்”, என தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மகன் கொஞ்சிக் கேட்கும் நிலைமை இருக்கிறது. ஆகவே இந்த அடிமை மனப்பான்மை மாறுவதற்கு ஏற்ற சூழ்நிலையை வகுத்துக் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்றால் நாம் தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்கள் எல்லோருக்கும் நிலம் அளிக்கவேண்டும்.

“அதுமட்டுமல்ல. இந்த அரசாங்கம் தியாகிகளுக்கு நிலம் அளிக்கிறோம் என்பதாக 10 ஏக்கரா, 20 ஏக்கரா, 50 ஏக்கரா என்று முன்பே நிலமுள்ள பல தியாகிகளுக்கு நிலத்தை வழங்கியிருக்கிறது. தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்கள் உழுதுகொண்டிருந்த நிலங்களைப் பிடுங்கி உதுமாதிரியாக வழங்கியிருக்கிறது. ஏழை நிலமற்ற தியாகிகளுக்கு நிலம் கொடுக்கவேண்டாமென்று நான் சொல்லவில்லை. நிலமுள்ள பணக்காரர்களுக்கு ஏழைகளின்

[Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar] [27th July 1953]

പറമ്പ് മാത്രമല്ല കറുപ്പനാട്ടു താലൂക്കിൽ കൂത്താളി എസ്റ്റേറ്റിൽ എത്രയോ ഏകു കൂടി ചെയ്യാവുന്ന സ്ഥലങ്ങളുണ്ട്. അങ്ങിനെ മലബാറിൽ ആയിരക്കണക്കിലുള്ള ഏകു ഭൂമി, കൂടിച്ചെയ്യാവുന്ന ഭൂമി ആവശ്യക്കാരായ ആളുകൾക്ക് പ്രതിഫലം കൂടാതെ അടിയന്തരമായി വിതരണം ചെയ്യുവാൻ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് നടപടി എടുക്കണം. ഒരു കാര്യം കൂടി ചൂണ്ടിക്കാണിക്കുവാൻ ഞാൻ ആഗ്രഹിക്കുന്നു. എന്തുകൊണ്ടാണ് പ്രതിഫലം വാങ്ങാതെ വീതിച്ചുകൊടുക്കണം എന്നു പറയുന്നത്. പ്രതിഫലം വാങ്ങുകയാണെങ്കിൽ പാവപ്പെട്ട കൂടിക്കാർ അവരുടെ ഭൂമിയിൽ ഉണ്ടാകണം അധികം മുഴുവൻ ജന്മിമാർക്കും പണക്കാരായ ആളുകൾക്കും പണയമായി കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിവരും. അപ്പോൾ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതും ഞങ്ങൾ ആഗ്രഹിച്ചതുമായ കാര്യത്തിന്നു ഫലമുണ്ടാകുകയില്ല. സർ, അധികം പറയുവാൻ ഞാൻ ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നില്ല. ഒരു സംഗതികൂടി പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ട് ഞാൻ ഉപസംഹരിക്കാം. മലബാറിൽ ദേവസ്വങ്ങളുടെ കീഴിലായി എത്രയോ ഏകു കൂടി ചെയ്യാവുന്ന ഭൂമികളുണ്ട്. പയ്യമ്പൂർ ദേവസ്വം, ചുഴലി ഭഗതി ദേവസ്വം, തിമിരി ദേവസ്വം, തൃച്ചംബരം, തളിപ്പറമ്പ്, കാഞ്ഞിരങ്ങാട്ട് ദേവസ്വങ്ങൾ (some names of the devaswams were mentioned. They may be included). ഇത് മലബാർ കടലാഴ്ച ബില്ലിൽ കൂടിക്കാർ കൊടുക്കുവാൻ വകുപ്പുകൾ ഉണ്ടെങ്കിലും അത് ഇന്നും പ്രയോജനപ്പെടാത്തതാണ് ഇരിക്കുന്നത്. അത് കൂടിച്ചെയ്യുന്ന ആളുകൾക്കു അടിയന്തരമായി കൊടുക്കുകൊണ്ട് ഈ നാട്ടിലെ കാക്കിം കുമ്പുത്തലിനെ ഒരു ഭഗതം പരിഹരിക്കുവാൻ സാധിക്കുമെന്നാണ് നോക്കേണ്ട കാര്യത്തിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ഉടൻ മുൻപു വരണം. കർക്കശാലിലാളികൾക്ക് ഭൂമി കൊടുത്ത് ഭക്ഷ്യോല്പാദനം വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യകത ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ മാത്രമല്ല, കൂടിക്കാരുടെ മാത്രമല്ല, ഈ നാട്ടിലെ എല്ലാ ജനവിഭാഗങ്ങളുടെയും അടിയന്തര കൺസ്യൂമാണ്. പുറംനായകവും സാമ്പത്തികവും ആയ എപ്പാ ജിവിത തുറക്കലിലും കണന്ന നൂറോമ്പാലക്കും ഉള്ള മെലികമായ കാരണം ഈ നാട്ടിലെ ഇന്നത്തെ കുമ്പുറം പിടിച്ചു കാക്കുക പ്രശ്നമാണ്. ഇത് കുമ്പുറം തീക്കുന്നതിനും അതിന്നു ഒരു പരിഹാരം കാണുവാനും ഗവണ്മെന്റ് മുൻപു വരേണ്ടതാണ്. ഒരു കാര്യംകൂടി, സർ, വെള്ളപ്പൊക്കത്തിൽ, ഏകകണക്കിലുള്ള ഹരിജനങ്ങൾ തോട്ടിന്റെ വക്കത്തും പുഴവക്കത്തും വീടുകൾ കെട്ടി താമസിച്ചതുകൊണ്ട് അവരുടെ കടലുകൾ അഞ്ചു തുകർന്നുപോയിരിക്കുന്നു. ഈ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ തന്നെയാണ് അവരെ വീണ്ടും കുടിയ്ക്കുക ഉണ്ടാകുവാൻ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് അനുവദിക്കുന്നതെങ്കിൽ അടുത്ത വെള്ളപ്പൊക്കത്തിൽ അവ വീണ്ടും കുലിച്ചുപോകാൻ ഇടയുള്ളതാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഇവയെ അപകടങ്ങൾക്ക് ഇടയില്ലാത്ത സ്ഥലങ്ങൾ പാവപ്പെട്ട ഹരിജനങ്ങൾക്ക് വീടു കെട്ടുപറാം കൂടിച്ചെയ്യുവാനും പരിച്ചുകൊടുക്കുവാനുമുള്ള നടപടി ഗവണ്മെന്റ് എടുക്കുന്നത് വിശ്വസിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു.

12-53
P.m.

* SRI K. SUBBA REDDI:—“అధ్యక్షా, నేను ఒకముఖ్యమైన విషయము మనవిచేయదలచాను. మా ఆంధ్రదేశములో ఈ రాజకీయ వాధితులు ఆ సేవారు దేశానికి, పేదవాళ్లకు ఒక శనిలాగా తయారైనారు. దేశములో ఎక్కడెక్కడ చెరులలమున్న, ఎక్కడెక్కడ బంజరు భూములున్నో పేదవాళ్లు కోర్లు కొట్టడానికి రాజకీయ వాధితులతోసం పిచ్చాడాయి అనుకుంటున్నాను. ఎన్నో సంవత్సరాలుగా నాగు చేసుకొనే వ్యవసాయ కూలీల వద్దనుంచి భూములను లాగుకొని యీ రాజకీయ వాధితులు ఆ సేవారికి యివ్వడమనే అన్యాయం ఇంతింతయని చెప్పటానికి అనివార్యమయినది. ఎండక, వానక, నెత్తురుపడిచి బంజరు భూములు వాగుచేసుకొని జీవించే యీ పేదవాళ్లనుంచి యీ భూములను లాగుకొని పొలము కలిగినవారికి రాజకీయ వాధితులనే నాకుతో భూములు కట్టిపెట్టడం యీ ప్రభుత్వానికి తగిందేనా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఈ మాదిరిగా పేదవాళ్లను అన్యాయంచేసి భూములను లాగుకోగూడదని ఎన్నో పర్యాయములు ఈ కానసభలో ప్రశ్నోత్తరాల సమయంలోను, చుత్తర ప్రశ్నోత్తరాల ద్వారాను, representations ద్వారాను ప్రభుత్వానికి తెలియపరచుచున్నాను. ఈ విషయంలో ప్రభుత్వంవారు చేసేవి దుర్మాయముని తెలిసినప్పటికిని యింతవరకు ఏ చర్యలేముకొనలేదు. కారణమడగా, దీనికి ఆ సేక రాజకీయ కారణాలున్నాయని ప్రభుత్వం సమాధానం చెబుతున్నారు. ఈ విధంగా

27th July 1953]

[Sri K. Subba Reddi]

వేదవాళ్లను అన్యాయం చేయవద్దని నేను పరుహులు మంత్రివర్గం దృష్టికి తీసుకుని వచ్చాను. అలాగే స్త్రీలను కాలయోజన చేస్తున్నారేగాని, వేద ప్రజలకు జీవనోపాధిని నిలబెట్టడమనేది శరణలేదు.

“ఈ విధంగా అన్యాయాలు జరిగినవి అనేకములున్నవి. ప్రభువరలకు కొన్ని నేను చెప్పడలచాను. మా పల్నాడు తాలూకాలో మండలి అనే గ్రామానికి చెందిన Reserve forest భూములను అక్కడవున్న చెంచువాళ్లకు ప్రభుత్వమే సాగు కొరకు యిచ్చారు. వాళ్లు యిప్పటికి సుమారు ఇరవై సంవత్సరాలుగా యీ భూములను వాగు చేసుకొని జీవించుచున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వమువారు యిటీవల ఆ భూములను వాళ్లవద్ద నుంచి లాగుకొని రాజకీయ బాధితులకు యిచ్చారు. ఎవ్వరి సంవత్సరాలుగా సాగు చేసుకొని జీవించే యీ చెంచువాళ్లను అన్యాయంచేసి రాజకీయ బాధితులకు యివ్వ వద్దని నేను మంత్రిగారికి చెప్పాను. వారు యింతవరకు ఏ చర్యతీసుకోలేదు. చెంచు వాళ్లకు జీవనం పోయినందున అనేక కష్టాలకు గురిఅవుతున్నారు. పిల్లలతో అల్లాడి పోతున్నారు. కాని ప్రభుత్వము తన విధానం మార్చుకోలేదు.

“మరొక విషయం చెబుతున్నాను. నరగులపాడు అనే గ్రామంలో చెరువుకింద సుమారు యాభై ఎకరాల భూమివున్నది. అదివరకు సాగుచేస్తున్నవాళ్ల వద్దనుంచి యీ భూములను తీసుకొని యీ భూములు మొత్తం రాజకీయ బాధితులకు ప్రభుత్వం వారు కట్టిపెట్టారు. అక్కడి ప్రజలకును, రాజకీయ బాధితులకును అనేక తగాదాలయి, చివరకు బరినెలుపు ప్రశ్నలు గిడుతూనే వున్నాయి. ఈ విధంగా ప్రభుత్వం అనేక విధాల వేద ప్రజలను అన్యాయం చేస్తున్నారు. నేను యీ విషయం ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టికి తీసుకొని వచ్చినప్పటికీ ప్రభుత్వంవారు నా విజ్ఞప్తిని వివటానికి నిరాకరించారు. ఈ విషయము మరి నేను స్వయముగా ప్రభుత్వానికి విజ్ఞప్తి చేశాను. అక్కడి కరిగితులు తెలియజేసినను ప్రభుత్వం ఏ చర్యతీసుకోకుండానే రాజకీయ బాధితుల వైపుకి ముగు చూపెడుతున్నారు. వేదవాళ్ల మొర అరికించే ప్రభుత్వం కాదని అనవలసి వచ్చింది.

“లంకల భూముల విషయంలో వేదవాళ్ల వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు ఎవ్వరి సంవత్సరాలుగా సాగుచేసుకుంటున్న భూములగూడ ప్రభుత్వంవారు లాగుతున్నారు. వేదవాళ్ల పట్ల ప్రభుత్వంవారు చాలా పక్షపాతం చూపెడుతున్నారు. ఒకప్పుడు వేదవాళ్లకు భూములు యిచ్చాము, సాగు చేసుకొమ్మని ఆర్డరులు పంపుతారు. ఆ ఆర్డర్లను మరల కొద్ది రోజులకి కాన్పులు చేశాం, రాజకీయ బాధితులకు యిచ్చామని అంటారు. ఇటువంటి అవకతవక ఆర్డర్లు యీ ప్రభుత్వంవారు యివ్వడమనేది చాలా విచారకరంగావున్నది. ఇటువంటి అవకతవక ఆర్డర్లు యిచ్చేవారు మంత్రి పదవులకు అర్హులైన అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఈ ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఎప్పుడు చూచినను అవకతవక ఆర్డర్లు, అవకతవక పరిపాలనచేస్తున్నారు. ఇప్పటికి యిరవై సంవత్సరాలుగా సాగు చేసుకొని జీవించే వేద ప్రజలనుండి యీ రోజున భూములను ఎందుకు లాగుకోవాలి అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఇదట ప్రభుత్వంవారు వీళ్లకు యీ భూములు ఎందుకు యిచ్చారు? వాళ్ల కష్టపడి వాగుచేసుకొని ఎంతో డబ్బు ఖర్చుపెట్టి యీ రోజుకు ప్రభుత్వంవారు పట్టాయిస్తారనే ఆశతో సాగుచేసుకొంటూ వుండే సమయంలో నేటికి యీ భూములను రాజకీయ బాధితులకు యిస్తామనడం న్యాయమేనా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఇందులో reasonableness అక్కడవున్నది అని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అడుగుతున్నాను. గ్రామములలో చూద్దామా, గ్రామ మునసబు కరణములు, వేదవాళ్ల నుంచి అన్యాయముగా పట్నా పికింటికి నాలుగు, ఆయిదు, పది రూపాయలు

[Sri K. Subba Reddi]

[27th July 1953]

పట్టా యిప్పిస్తామని అజ్ఞప్త అశలు పెట్టి వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులకు లంచాలు యిస్తేనేగాని పట్టా యివ్వరిని మభ్యపరచి ఎంతో డబ్బు కాజేస్తున్నారు. ఇదంతా చూస్తే ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఒకవిధంగా corruption కు అవకాశ మిస్తున్నారని అవలసి వస్తున్నది. ఈ విధంగా అనేక గ్రామాలలో అనేకమంది పేద ప్రజలను అన్యాయము చేసి యీ కిరణము ముస సబులు డబ్బును అక్రమంగా వసూలుచేస్తున్నారు. ఇప్పటికి ఇరవై సంవత్సరాలుగా నేద్యము చేచుకొని జీవించే వ్యవసాయ కూలీలనుంచి యీనాడు ఆ భూములను లాగుకొని రాజీయ వాధితులకు యిస్తామని ప్రభుత్వంవారు అంటున్నారంటే, యంతకంటే దురన్యాయము, యింకొకటి వున్నదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. పేద ప్రజల ఆశలు నిరాశలు చేస్తున్నారు. ఎంతో భూమి వున్న సంజీవ రెడ్డిగారివంటి వారికి యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఎంతో విశవగల భూమిని కట్టిపెట్టారు. ఇక భూమి లేని వాళ్ల సంగతి ఎవరు ఆలోచించేటట్టు? వ్యవసాయ కూలీలనుంచిన్న భూములు లాగుతున్నారు. పేదవాళ్ల వద్దనుంచిన్న లాగుతున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వము యీనాడు భూములు కట్టిపెట్టి దలచిన రాజీయ వాధితులలో నూటికి తొంభై మంది భూములివ్వ వారేకాని, లేనివారు ఎవరూ లేరు. దీనికి కారణము ఏమని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అడిగితే, దానికి అనేక రాజకీయ కారణాలున్నవని సమాధానము చెబుతున్నారు. ఈ రాజకీయ వాధితులు అనాడు స్వార్థపరత్వముతో అనాడు జైలుకు వెళ్లి యీనాడు భూములను సంపాదించుకొని తయారైనారు. నిజంగా వీరు ప్రజలకు చేసిన నేప విమిటి అని అడుగుతున్నాను. వారి భూములుంటే, యింటివద్ద జీవనము స్రమంగా నిర్వృతగా జరిగేవారు జైళ్లలో ఎన్నాళ్లుంటే నేమి? భూమి లేనివారు అవిధంగా జైలుకు వెళ్లితే, యింటివద్ద భార్య బిడ్డల జీవనము ఎట్లా అనేది ఆలోచనతో యీ పేదవాళ్లు జైలుకు వెళ్ల నుద్దేశించలేదు లేకపోయిన ఎడల, పేదవాళ్ల రాజకీయ వాధితులు అయియుండేవారు. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ రాజకీయ వాధితులకు భూములు యివ్వడమనే విధానం మార్చుకోవాలని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ విధంగా భూములు లాగుకోవడంవల్ల ఎన్నో పేద కుటుంబాలు నాశనమయి, కిల్లల దగ్గరనుంచి తిండి లేక అల్లాడి పోతున్నారనే సంగతి ప్రభుత్వమువారు ముఖ్యంగా గుర్తించాలి. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ విషయములో తీవ్రంగా ఆలోచించి యీ రాజకీయ వాధితుల సమస్య మరిక విధంగా పరిష్కరించ బడాలి కాని, భూములివ్వడ మనేది మంచిది కాదు. భూములివ్వవారికి భూములు యిస్తామంటే, యిక పేద జనుల గతి ఏమిటో ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఆలోచించాలి.

“మరిక చిన్న ఉదాహరణ యిస్తాను. తమ్మకంట అనే గ్రామములో నువూరు ఆరువందల ఎకరాలు పేదలకు కృమి పద్ధతి మీద సాగుకు యిచ్చారు. మరల రెండు నెలలకే cancel చేసినారు. ఏ కారణాల మూలంగా యిచ్చారు? ఎందువల్ల cancel చేసారు? కాకినాడ conservator వచ్చి చూచి ఓయి బాబూ! ఆరువందల ఎకరాలు సాగుకు యివ్వడమేనా? అని దురుద్దేశంతో అవుడు రిపోర్టు పంపించాడు. ఈ భూముల సారవంతమైనవి కావచ్చు. ఈ భూములు మొత్తానికి ఎకరానికి, పది, పాతిక రూపాయలు యిస్తే ఏ పది ఇరవై వేల రూపాయలలో ప్రత్యేకంగా సంపాదించుకోవచ్చు. గనుక యీ భూములను ప్రభుత్వము కాపస్సు చేశారు. మొదలు యీ భూములు వాళ్లకు యివ్వడము ఎందుకు? యీ రోజున కాపస్సులు చేయడము ఎందుకు? ఈ విషయములో న్యాయాన్యాయాలు మంత్రి వర్గానికి తెలియదా! పేద ప్రజలు, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు యీ భూములను సాగుచేసి కుంటు న్నారు. ఈ విషయములో నేను మంత్రిగారికి ఎక్కు విధాల విజ్ఞప్తి చేశాను. వారు నా విజ్ఞప్తి విషయం తప్పించుకొనే జవాబు లిస్తారే గాని పేద ప్రజలకు న్యాయము

27th July 1953]

[Sri K. Subba Reddi]

చేసేటట్లు లేదు. మార్కెటు వాలుకు భూములు యిచ్చే ఎడల ధనవంతులతో పోటీ చేయడము యీ పేదవాళ్లకు వీలుంటుందా? కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ విషయంలో దీర్ఘంగా ఆలోచించి పేదవాళ్లకు భూములు యివ్వటానికి ప్రభుత్వ విధానములో మార్పు లేవాలని కోరుతూ ఇంతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను."

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH:—“అభ్యుక్త మహాశయ, దేశములో వ్యవసాయ కూలీలుగా వుంటే వారు ఎక్కువగా హరిజనులలోనే వున్నారు. వీరు కడు పేదవారుగా వుండినందున, ఎక్కువగా వ్యవసాయముమీద ఆధారపడి జీవించుచున్నారు. ఈ పేద హరిజనుల స్థితిగతులు బాగుచేయటానికి రాజ్యాంగ వట్టుముక్తింద ఒక శాసనము తయారుచేయాలని యిప్పటికి పది సంవత్సరాలుగా ప్రయత్నాలు జరుగుచున్నవి. కాని యింతవరకు యీ హరిజన జాతికి వివిధమైన సౌకర్యాలు కలుగచేయబడలేదు. వీరి ఆర్థికస్థితి తృప్తికరముగ లేనందున దేశములోని భాగ్యవంతులయిన వారు యీ హరిజనులను అనుచితముగ చూస్తున్నారు. రాజ్యాంగ వట్టుములో వీరికి స్వతంత్రము యిస్తూ, వీరికి గృహవసతి వర్గాలు కల్పించితేనేగాని, వీరు స్థితిగతులు బాగుపడవు. ప్రతి విషయములోను వీరు వెనుకబడిన వారుగా వున్నారు. భాగ్యవంతులే ముందడుగు వేస్తున్నారు. హరిజనులనుగూడ తక్కినవారితోగూడ సరిసమాన స్థాయికి తీసుకురావాలంటే, యిప్పుడు వీరికిగాను ఒక శాసనము తీసుకొనిరావటము అత్యవసరమయియున్నది. లేనట్లైతే హరిజనులస్థితి యధాప్రకారంగానే వుంటుంది. ఇప్పుడు రాజ్యాంగములో వున్నటువంటి ఆనేక విషయాలు పరిశీలించవలసియుంటుంది. ఎక్కడెక్కడ భూములున్నటువంటి వారు అందరుగూడా భాగ్యవంతులుగా వున్నారుగాని, పేదవాళ్లకు దేశములో తాళలేకుండా, సౌకర్యాలు వివిధంగానుగూడా లేకుండ ఉంటున్నారు. దేశములో పొరంబోకు భూములున్నవి. ఈ భూములు చాలా పట్టుకు భాగ్యవంతులు గ్రామాలలో బలవంతులుగా వుండడమువల్ల పేదవాళ్లకు, హరిజనులకు దక్కకుండా చేస్తున్నారు. ఈ భూములు హరిజనులకు, పేదవాళ్లకు యిచ్చినట్లైతే, వారు ఆర్థికంగా బాగుపడటానికి అవకాశం వుంటుంది. హరిజనులను ఆర్థికంగాను, సాంఘికంగాను, విధ్యావిషయకంగాను ముందుకు తీసుకురావలసిన బాధ్యత ప్రభుత్వానిది, ప్రజలది అయియున్నది. భూములు యిచ్చినఎడల ఆర్థికంగా ఒకవిధంగా బాగుపడటానికి సావకాశము కలుగుతుంది. ఈ నాడు భారత దేశములోని 36 కోట్ల జనావాలో, మూడు 7 కోట్ల వరకు హరిజనులే వున్నారు. వారి ఆర్థికస్థితి బాగుచేయాలంటే, వారికి భూములిచ్చి భాగ్యవంతులను, బలవంతులను చేయాలి. అట్టి పద్ధతులను యింతవరకెప్పుడో ఆమలు పెట్టవలసినది. ఇప్పుడైనా ప్రభుత్వము ఆలోచించి ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని ఆంగీకరించి ఆమలులోనికి తెస్తే హరిజనులకు మేలుకలుగజేసిన వారమవుతాము. దేశములో అనేకచోట్ల పొరంబోకు భూములు హరిజనుల సాగుచేసుకుంటున్నారు. బలవంతులైనవారు, ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులను వలతాసిచేసుకొని యీ హరిజనులకు యీ భూములు దక్కకుండా విదోవిధంగా లాగివేయటానికి ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నారు. ఇప్పటికే ప్రభుత్వము పరిపరివిధాలుగా అర్హులయిచ్చి కాన్పులచేయడం జరుగుతున్నది. హరిజనులు జిల్లాఅధికారి అయిన కలెక్టరు వద్దకు వెళ్లి కుర్రాడు, మొర్రో, భూములు లాగుకుంటున్నారని. మొర్రపెట్టుకోగా, ఆ కలెక్టరు ప్రభుత్వము వారి ఎద్దకు వెళ్లమంటున్నారు. మీరుగూడా ప్రభుత్వమువారే గదా, మాభూములు మాకు యిప్పించండి అని అడిగితే, మీరు చెప్పేదిఅంతయు నిజమే, మావల్ల ఏమీకాదు, వైవారినుంచి అర్హులు తెచ్చుకొండి అని చెప్పి పంపుతున్నారు. ఈ ప్రభుత్వ విధానము యీ విధంగా జరుగుతూవుంటే, యీ పేద హరిజనుల మొర్ర అలకించేది ఎవరు?

[Sri P. Venkatasubbiah]

[27th July 1953]

“కర్తవ్య ప్రభుత్వం కాదా? కర్తవ్య ప్రభుత్వంలో భాగం కాకపోతే, ఇదంతా ఎల్లా జరుగుతుందో ఆలోచించవలసిందని కొరుకున్నాను. ఎక్కువ అర్జీలు వుండడంవల్ల ప్రభుత్వం ఇంకా కొంతమంది ఉద్యోగులను అదనంగాచేసి, అర్జీలన్నీ పూర్తిగా పరిష్కరించడమేల్లా చూడాలి. పొరంబోకు భూములన్నీ సర్వే అయ్యేట్లా చూసి, అర్థికంగా బాగా పేదలుగా వున్నవారికి భూములను మంజూరుచేయాలని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. హరిజనులు వివిధంగా పైకి వస్తారనేది ఆలోచించాలి. హరిజనులతో మీరంతా దేవుని పిల్లలు, హరికి సంబంధించినవారు, అందుచేత దేవుని బిడ్డలు అని వెబునూంటే చాలదు. హరిజనులు దేవుని బిడ్డలయితే తక్కినవాళ్లంతా దెయ్యాల బిడ్డలా? హరిజనులు అర్థికంగా పైకి పోయేట్లాచేసి, నిజంగా హరికి బిడ్డలుగా తయారుచేయాలి. అది మన ధర్మము, రాజకీయ ధర్మం, ప్రభుత్వ ధర్మమూడా, ఎప్పుడైతే నునిపేకి కడుపునిండా ఆన్నం వుంటుందో, అప్పుడు సంతృప్తి వుంటుంది. ఆన్నం పెట్టకుండా హరిజనులని పేరు పెట్టాము. హరిజనులని అంటే ఏమిలాభం? సత్యం, అహింసకు మూలమైన గాంధీగారి ప్రథమ శిష్యులు మీరు అని వెబునూంటే చాలదు. ఏ విధంగా వీరిందరికి కడుపునిండా కూడు కలగేది అనేది ప్రధానంగా చూడాలని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. బంజరు భూములను హరిజనులకు, వీదలకు కేటాయించి ఇవ్వాలని ప్రార్థిస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—“ Mr. Speaker, I generally agree with the principle underlying this resolution that in the matter of granting lands to political sufferers great injustice has been done. If I remember right, in the original circular issued by the Government there was a stipulation that the applicant should not possess more than five acres of wet land or corresponding dry land. But I don't believe that this stipulation has been observed. Though many in Malabar have not been given lands under this scheme, I think those who are in possession are not at all entitled for the same. In addition, one clause in the circular was greatly abused. The circular stipulated various categories of political sufferers and there was a residuary clause which enabled all persons who had suffered violence at the hands of the police to claim this benefit. I think this particular clause was used or abused to confer benefits on the favourites of the Provincial Congress Presidents who were entitled to grant certificates. Therefore this land gift to political sufferers has been done indiscriminately. It is not those that are entitled to it or really deserve it that are now enjoying. The question of poramboke or other waste land acquires great importance when we consider the condition of the homeless, landless labourers and the Harijans. The benefit of house-sites by Harijans is negligible in Malabar because in Malabar there are not as much of Government lands or poramboke lands which can be given to the landless Harijans. While in the State as a whole when more than a lakh of house-sites have been granted to the Harijans by way of gift or by way of assignment, not one house-site has been given to the Harijans in Malabar and even proposals for acquisition of house-sites have been pending for the last three to five years. I would strongly press the claim of landless poor and Harijans for a dwelling site on the Government lands and porambokes. Sir, the Malabar Tenancy Act is to be amended and it is one of the knotty problems to

27th July 1953] [Sri M. Narayana Kurup]

provide house-sites to these Harijans who can be turned out at the sweet will of the landlord. Therefore, Sir, when we consider the condition of innumerable poor peasants who have not a house-site of their own, it certainly behoves the Government to give the topmost priority to the problem of housing the poor and landless Harijans. I heartily support the general principle underlying this resolution."

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—" Sir, I rise to oppose this resolution. I do not know what the Government are going to say about this resolution, but I oppose this resolution. ('Hear,' 'hear' from Opposition Benches.) Please hear me. I oppose this resolution for two reasons. The hon. Member who moved this resolution seems to be a Member belonging to the Communist Party. (Sri T. Nagi Reddi: 'He is') Very good. Mr. Nagi Reddi confirms that he is a member of the Communist Party. I thank Mr. Nagi Reddi for the same. I could not understand, I am really surprised why Mr. Nagi Reddi and other Communists of all others, support this resolution. They are Communists. Communists never believe in the allotment of three or four acres. They are totally against private ownership. They want collectivisation of all lands. They are for collective farming."

1-10
p.m.

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" May I know from whom has Mr. Swaminathan learnt this? "

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—" I have learnt it from Mr. Nagi Reddi himself, Sir. (Laughter.) Sir, I am one of those who believe in the equal distribution of land. But on what principle? Surely it is not on the principle on which the Communists want it. I know the Communists do not believe in the spirit of the resolution. They really do not care for the extent of land assigned to political sufferers. They support this resolution only to attack the political sufferers. That is the main reason behind their support to this resolution. Only to attack the political sufferers the Communists and some other members have supported the resolution. The Communists form one group. The others support on some other grounds. My friend, Mr. Narayana Kurup, says that he is supporting the resolution because he thinks that these lands had been assigned only to the favourites of the Provincial Congress Committee Presidents. Let me inform the House that Mr. Narayana Kurup was there at that time in the Provincial Congress Committee. He did not oppose it at that time. But now that he has left the Congress, he is finding fault with it. Time and again this subject of 'assignment of lands to political sufferers' is being discussed and discussed. Yesterday there was a short-notice question under this head. A volley of supplementaries were put and answered. I thought that that subject would come to an end. But to-day it is being re-opened. Is there no end, Sir? After all what is the wrong in assigning lands to political sufferers? Is it not justified? Have not the political sufferers suffered a lot during the period of 'civil disobedience'? Are they not 'thyagis'? Well,

[Sri R. V. Swaminathan] [27th July 1953]

then, after independence and when we are masters of our own affairs, is there anything strange if the State Government come forward to reward these 'thyagis' and assign them lands? Why should the Communists oppose the same then? I had already answered. It is only to attack the political sufferers. Nothing more than that. Why did the Communists keep quiet then when the British Government allotted lands for ex-servicemen after the Second World War, in recognition of their loyal service? Why did not the Communists oppose it then? Why should they do so now? It is all only to attack the political sufferers. They complain that such and such of the persons who had been assigned lands have not been cultivating their lands, that so and so is abusing the kind gesture shown by the Government and so on and so forth. One after the other, they go on making some allegation or other. If they have any individual cases let them point out to the Hon. Minister concerned, let them request the Minister to take suitable action or let them bring it to the notice of the Hon. Chief Minister or let them put a short-notice question and elicit information. For God's sake let them not indulge in open attack against political sufferers. Say that lands might be allotted to the landless poor, or something like that. But do not attack the political sufferers wholesale. This is what I would beg of my Communist friends.

"With these words I oppose this resolution *in toto*."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ Mr. Speaker, the assignment of banjar lands is the most acute problem that the Government have got to face. I admit that. As Mr. Swaminathan pointed out I am only attacking the political sufferers, who had misused the land assigned to them, who had derived profit out of it and who had not fulfilled the purpose for which the lands were assigned to them. I am not attacking the principle of assignment of lands to political sufferers. I am only against the misuse of that very principle. No doubt the political sufferers have undergone untold miseries and troubles during the days of the 'Civil Disobedience Movement' and 'Quit India Campaign'. I am not objecting to those 'Political Sufferers' being allotted lands for cultivation purposes. But what is it that is being done? Not all 'Patriots' are assigned lands. I know several instances wherein foul-play and forgery have played their part. Let me cite an instance. One day a person came to Desabhakta Konda Venkatappiah. At that time Desabhakta Venkatappiah was in good mood. The person asked him casually 'Do you remember me? Don't you recognize me? Are you not able to remember that both of us were there in Guntur Jail?'. Desabhakta probably thought that he might have come across this person in the jail. So he replied 'Perhaps, it may be so'. The person immediately asked 'In that case, can you please oblige me with a certificate to that effect'. Thinking that the concerned person might utilise that certificate for some good purpose, in good humour the Desabandu gave him the certificate. What did the person do? He went to the Congress President, proved that

27th July 1953] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

he was a political sufferer, showed the certificate and finally got some lands. Meanwhile I happened to meet him. The first question I put to him was whether he knew what was a cell. The man could not give a ready answer. How can he give? If he had really gone to a jail, he may know what is a cell and a cellar. This is the type of political sufferer which the Congress Government had rewarded. That is why I oppose such kind of assignment tooth and nail. I know another instance in Rajampet taluk, Cuddapah district. A political sufferer, that is how he is termed, had been assigned lands totalling 15 acres. He had erected a compound wall throughout, on all the sides of his 15-acre plot with granite stone. Imagine the cost of such a construction? Imagine how much money he would have spent for cement, concrete, lime, mortar and the like? When he had been able to erect a compound wall, how much wealthy he ought to have been? When such is the case, what is the meaning in assigning lands to him, when he is already so wealthy? Who is a political sufferer? Is he a political sufferer? No, he is not. It is the labourers who work till their sweat gets dried up. Because it is they who suffer and are made to suffer by these 'politicals'. That is why I say when you embark on a policy of 'assignment of lands to political sufferers' assign the same to the 'real sufferers' and not to bogus people who commit all sorts of offences like forgery, etc., to prove their case. Assign lands to the poor, down-trodden, landless poor who will in all earnestness cultivate the lands and eke out their livelihood. That should be the spirit. I shall cite another instance wherein abuse of the privilege shown to the political sufferer is obvious.

"Vast tracts of sivoijama lands are now being encroached upon and annexed to their own not by ordinary poor landless Harijans but by big landlords who own 500 or 600 acres and this is being favoured by the Government. Without any right to the land, they are getting tenancy and other things. These lands must be taken away from them and must be distributed to the landless people. But the whole thing is done in this way. There are some landless Harijan people who are actually cultivating the land. Now, a Congressman comes with police help and says 'This plot of land was granted to me by the Collector or by a Committee. So please evict the man who is cultivating. It is my land. It is a banjar land. It is in my name'. Thus lands under cultivation by poor people are taken away and made over to people who already possessed many acres of land. The village karnam, who is a clever man, is there to help these people. I know certain cases where people who are allotted lands do not even know where they are. It is the karnam who tells them that it is situated somewhere. If land is to be given under the guise of political suffering to people who are already having lands, I say it is not the so-called political sufferer who is suffering but the country is suffering. That is why I say that land must be given only to the landless people. The people who are already cultivating the land must be allowed to be there in spite of its being given to a political sufferer or a Minister or an ex-Minister or an would-be

1-20
P.m.

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [27th July 1953]

Minister! (Laughter.) Another issue that I have to explain is this. In some cases, members of the same family form themselves into a Co-operative Society with their kith and kin as members in order to obtain assignments of lands. Vast extents of land are being assigned to such Societies. They are having thousands of acres. What is the idea in assigning lands to a man who could afford the expenditure and in depriving people who have no lands or who have reclaimed waste lands by the sweat of their brow? These abuses must be put an end to. I therefore appeal to the Hon. the Chief Minister and the Hon. the Revenue Minister to see that lands are given to political sufferers who are actually suffering and whose wives and children are dying to-day out of starvation. Grants must be made to such people and not to big and rich people like Sri Sanjeevi Reddi who have got enough of landed properties. In those days, there were some people who went to the jail saying that it is a profit to do so. I know a man has gone to the jail lest he should lose the chance of becoming a Taluk Board Member or becoming a member of the Assembly. So I ask 'Are these people landless people?'. There are plenty of lands. Forest banjar lands are there. There are banjar lands on the Romperu drain. The problem is how best to distribute the lands to really deserving and actually suffering political sufferers and landless people to improve the food production. I can say that if I have to get land because of 'political suffering' I must be given 60 acres of wet land because I have gone to jail a dozen times. It is not for the land that I have gone. I have gone to jail to make the highest sacrifice and I stand by the highest ideals. My only appeal is that land must be distributed to the landless people or labourers who actually cultivate the land. That must be the guiding principle in the matter of land distribution. With these words, Sir, I support this resolution."

1-25
p.m.

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, எனக்கு சிறிது நேரத்திற்கு முன்பு பேசிய கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ஆர். வி. சுவாமிநாதன் அவர்கள் பேசியதைப் பற்றி நான் சந்தோஷப்படுகிறேன். ஏனென்றால் அவரைப்போல் இருக்கக்கூடிய அங்கத்தினர்கள் பேசினால்தான் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுடைய உண்மையான நோக்கம் கொஞ்சம் தெளிவாகும். இப்பொழுது தியாகிகளுடைய தியாகத்தைப்பற்றி யாரும் கேட்கவில்லை. தியாகிகளுக்கு கனம் ஆர். வி. சுவாமிநாதன் ஆதரவு கொடுப்பதைவிட கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சி மெம்பர்கள் அதிகமாகச் சன்மாணம், ஆதரவும் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொல்வது கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சியின் இயல்பு. அதனால் தியாகிகளை குறைத்துக்கூற விரும்பவில்லை. உண்மையிலேயே தேசத்திற்காக தியாகம் செய்த இப்பொழுது கஷ்டப்பட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கக்கூடியவர்கள் யாராக இருந்தாலும் அவர்களுக்கு நிலம் கொடுப்பதோடு வேறு எந்தத் துறையிலும் அரசாங்கம் அவர்களுக்கு உதவி செய்தால் அதை ஒருநாளும் மறுக்கமாட்டோம். ஆனால் தியாகிகளுக்கு நிலம் கொடுப்பது என்ற பெயரால் நிலம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கப் பட்டவர்கள் எல்லோரும் தியாகம் செய்தவர்களா அல்லது நிலமில்லாதவர்களா? ஆனால் இப்பொழுது வருஷத்திற்கு ஐந்து லட்சம் ரூபாய்க்கு மேல் வருமானம் வரக்கூடியவர்களுக்கும் ஐந்து ஏக்கர் நிலம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஆந்திர தேச காங்கிரஸ் தலைவர் கனம் என். சஞ்ஜீவி ரெட்டி அவர்கள் இன்றைக்கு என்னக் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார் என்பது தெரியவில்லை. ஒருக்கால் முதல் அமைச்சர் பதவி கிடைக்கவேண்டும் என்று அவர் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கலாம்.”

27th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“The resolution states that temporary assignments of land made to political sufferers should be cancelled and that land should be reassigned. There is no question of a general review of grants made to political sufferers. Therefore I would request Mr. Kalyanasundaram to confine himself to the resolution as such and not to go beyond that unnecessarily because there is very little time.”

*** SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—**“எனக்கு சிறிது நேரத்திற்கு முன் பேசிய கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ஆர். வி. சுவாமிநாதன் அவர்கள் பேசிய தால்தான் அதைப்பற்றி நான் பேசுகிறேன். அதற்குள் ஒன்றிரண்டு நிமிஷங்கள் முடிந்துவிட்டன.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“நீங்கள் அடுத்த நாளில் தொடர்ந்தும் பேசலாம்.”

*** SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—**“கனம் நிதி அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் சொல்லிய யோசனையின்படியேதான் நான் பேசிக்கொண்டிருப்பேன். ஓரதிருஷ்டவசமாக அவருக்குப் பின்னால் உட்கார்ந்திருக்கக்கூடிய அங்கத்தினர்கள் பேசியதால்தான் நான் இவ்விதம் பேசவேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டது. இதுவரையிலும் நான் பேசவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணமே எனக்குக் கிடையாது. கனம் ஆர். வி. சுவாமிநாதன் அவர்கள் பேசியதன் பேரில்தான் நான் பேச முன்வந்தேன். உண்மையிலேயே கஷ்டப்பட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கக்கூடிய தியாகிகளுக்கு நிலம் கொடுப்பதைப்பற்றி நாங்கள் கேட்கவில்லை. தற்காலிகமாக நிலம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிற விஷயத்தைப் பற்றிக்கூட நாங்கள் கேட்கவில்லை. தேசத்திற்கு என்று கஷ்டப்பட்டவர்கள் யாராயிருந்தாலும் அவர்களுக்கு என்ன செய்ய வேண்டுமென்றாலும் அதை ஆட்சேபிக்கவில்லை. தியாகிகளுக்கு நிலம் கொடுத்ததைப்பற்றி நாங்கள் வெறுக்கவில்லை. அதைத் தாக்க வேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத்துடன் இந்த தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவரவில்லை. மாஜி ராணுவத்தினருக்கும் நிலம் கொடுப்பதை ஆதரிக்கிறோம். ஆனால், அரசியல் தியாகிகளுக்கு நிலம் கொடுப்பதைப்பற்றி ஆட்சேபிக்கிறோம் என்ற குற்றச்சாட்டு சொல்லப்படுகிறது. மாஜி ராணுவத்தினர் சம்பளத்திற்காக வேலை செய்தார்கள். என்றைக்காவது அரசாங்கம் தங்களுடைய சேவைகளுக்குத் தகுந்த சன்மானம் கிடைக்காதா என்பதற்காக அவர்கள் வேலை செய்தார்கள். அவர்களுக்குக் கொடுப்பது நியாயமென்றே கருதுகிறோம். ஆனால் தேசத் தியாகிகள் என்ற காரணத்தால் அரசியல் காரணம் நடக்கக்கூடாது என்கின்ற காரணத்தால்தான் இந்த தீர்மானத்தை நாங்கள் பிரேரேபிக்கிறோம்.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“இதைப்பற்றி நீங்கள் அடுத்த Non-official நாளில் தொடர்ந்து பேசலாம்.”

“The House will now adjourn and meet again at 8-30 a.m. to-morrow.”

The House then adjourned.

ten adjourned.

[27th July 1953]

APPENDIX.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 1084 asked by Sri M. Rajeswara Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 27th July 1953, page 1420 supra.]

(a) Yes.

(b) The following action has been taken by the Government from time to time to minimise the inconvenience :—

(i) Normally the Tribunals should hold their sittings only at the headquarters of each district. In order to avoid inconvenience and expenses to parties, the Government have ordered that if the parties so desire there is no objection to their cases being heard at the headquarters of any neighbouring district. The Government have also ordered that Tribunals should pass orders in urgent cases at their headquarters after hearing the cases at the district headquarters. Further under instructions recently issued by the Government, cheques are being delivered by Tribunals at the headquarters of the district to which a particular payee belongs when the Tribunal sits at that station. If the payee makes a request that the cheques be delivered earlier either at the headquarters of the Tribunal or at the nearest camping station according to his choice, it is being done. On a representation from the Bar Association, Srikakulam, and the Inam Ryots' Association, the Government have ordered that hearing of cases relating to the Srikakulam district, the Tribunal at Vizianagaram should hold its sittings at Srikakulam as Vizianagaram is far away to most places lying north of Srikakulam.

(ii) In order to prevent frivolous and vexatious claims, the Government have ordered the levy of Court-fees on applications from creditors. In addition, the Tribunals have also been instructed to make use of section 35-A of the Civil Procedure Code, to award costs in appropriate cases. A specific rule empowering the Tribunals to award costs has also been framed.

(iii) The Government have decided to step up the total amount of advance compensation payable under section 54-A to Rs. 6½ crores and that out of this a sum of Rs. 3 crores should be paid in bonds. A rule under section 40 (1) of the Abolition Act has been framed for taking powers for the deposit of advance compensation in bonds. Instructions have also been issued to the Estate Abolition Tribunals to adopt the following procedure for quick payment of advance compensation. :—

(a) The Tribunal shall set apart—

(1) one-fifth of each of the said amounts for the purpose of meeting the claims of maintenance holders.

(2) such portion of each of the said amounts as, in its opinion, may be required for the purpose of meeting the claims made, within six months from the date on which the amount was deposited in the office of the Tribunal, by the creditors and other

27th July 1953]

persons (not being sharers and maintenance holders) and apportion the balance among the sharers as far as possible in accordance with the value of their respective interests. The provisions of sections 44 (2), 45 (6), 48, 49, 51, 52 and 53 shall apply in respect of the said balance.

(b) Before paying the amount due to a sharer under clause (a), the Tribunal shall require him to enter into a bond with two sureties undertaking to refund the amount, if any, payable which on final determination of the total amounts payable to the claim out of (i) the amount deposited under section 54-A, subsections (i) and (ii) the amount deposited in bonds, may be found to have been paid to him in excess.

(iv) Till recently there were only three Tribunals with headquarters at Vizianagaram, Chittoor and Madurai. As it is felt that there is heavy work for the Tribunals and to minimise their jurisdiction thereby minimising the inconvenience to parties, a fourth Tribunal with the headquarters at Nuzvid, Krishna district, has been constituted.



